

THE
**SOCIALIST
STANDARD**

1907

The
Official Organ
of
The
Socialist Party
of
Great Britain.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

No. 29. VOL. 3.]

LONDON, JANUARY, 1907.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

RIOT AND REVOLUTION.

Speech by Rosa Luxemburg on Trial for Inciting to Riot.

On the twelfth of last month Rosa Luxemburg was tried at the Criminal Court at Weimar for "inciting to the use of physical force" by the speech she contributed to the discussion on the General Strike at the annual Congress of the German Socialist Party held in 1905 at Jena.

The court was densely crowded. Besides a great number of Socialists the audience included a good many "ladies of the highest Bourgeoisie," the President of the Supreme Court, and last but not least, a representative of the Ministry.

The incriminating speech having been read the Public Prosecutor submitted his case as follows:

Public Prosecutor's Charge. "After Bebel had spoken at the Party Congress in favour of the General Strike, other speakers, who took part in the discussion, expressed disapproval of the use of such means as the General Strike could lead to a physical force revolution, at which the workers may be defeated. Then followed the accused, who derided and sneered at these objections, more especially as they were living in the year of the 'glorious Russian revolution.' She said: 'we should be fools if that would be no lesson to us,' and she emphasised the fact that in Germany we had also arrived at that point where Evolution must give way to Revolution. Respecting her comrade, Heine, she stated he was not in touch with the masses, who, as history proves, had always shed their blood for the exploiting class; and she thought they may once shed their blood for their own class. These are the main points of the speech, which dealt less with the General Strike than with the Revolution. In fact the accused mentioned only now and then the General Strike, in order to be able to talk about the principal point, viz., the Revolution. In that way the incitement to the use of physical force was thrown out to the masses who are confused already, and the sanguinary seriousness of the speech was crowned by a quotation from the Communist Manifesto that the workers have nothing to lose but their chains. The accused desires that the object of the Socialist Party should not be attained by parliamentary means or by the means of the General Strike, but by a physical force revolution; and the speech was made to incite the masses to break their chains. It was to happen in our country just as in Russia. All this amounts to an incitement to the use of physical force. Her words were such as to create excitement among the masses and from the standpoint of law and order it is most significant that the accused occupies a prominent position in her Party and by virtue of her heedlessness has considerable influence and hence is exceptionally dangerous. I ask the Court to pass a sentence of four months' imprisonment upon the accused."

Counsel for the defence, Kurt Rosenfeld, answered with a brilliant speech from the Socialist as well as from the juridical standpoint, but the limited space of THE STANDARD unfortunately does not permit our reproducing more

than the speech of Rosa Luxemburg who followed her Council. She said:

Rosa Luxemburg's Reply. "My defending Counsel having dealt with the juridical aspect I wish to explain my own conception and that generally held in my Party regarding the question of the General Strike and the use of physical force. But before doing so I must refer to the argument which the Public Prosecutor used a moment ago. I cannot help saying that I was really astonished at the carelessness with which an official representative of the law ascribes the responsibility for affairs like the Hamburg street riots to a Three Million Party, the Socialist Party."

The presiding judge, interrupting the accused, warned her not to indulge in expressions such as "carelessness," which he thought would not be helpful to her case.

Rosa Luxemburg (continuing): "I think that it is particularly necessary for me to draw attention to—let me say—the complacency with which the Public Prosecutor, in face of an express decision by a Court of Law to the contrary, wants to make us responsible for the Hamburg riots, for this is on a par with the complacency with which in this case he ascribes to me the intention of inciting to the use of physical force by my Jena speech."

"Counsel for the prosecution holds that my excited tone deserved grave consideration. But surely the tone is a matter of individual temperament. Why, is it not possible that one may speak most excitedly, yet may present a strictly scientific conception, while, on the other hand, one may speak very quietly, yet present a very crude, unscientific, and alarming conception? And as far as my conception in regard to the question of the General Strike is concerned, I hold the view that neither a revolution nor a great, serious General Strike can be produced or provoked in an artificial manner."

The General Strike. As the Public Prosecutor has referred to my speech at Mannheim, I may, perhaps, be permitted, for the purpose of making clear my conception, to quote here some passages from a pamphlet on the General Strike, a pamphlet I wrote purposely for this year's Party Congress at Mannheim. In that pamphlet I say, for instance, on page 33:

"It suffices to sum up what I have said in the foregoing, in order to obtain an explanation as to the question of the said leadership and initiative of the General Strike. If the General Strike does not mean one separate action but an entire period of the class struggle, and if that period is identical with a period of revolution, it must be clear that a General Strike could not be called forth at will, even if such resolve should emanate from the unanimous forces of the strongest Socialist Party. Seeing that the Socialist Party is really powerless as far as the setting on foot and the suppressing of revolutions according to its own sweet will are concerned, neither the greatest enthusiasm nor the utter-

most impatience of the Socialist forces could provoke a real period of General Strikes that would culminate in a live, mighty movement of the masses."

"And on page 50 of the pamphlet you will find the following statement:

"While it is on the one hand difficult to predict with certainty whether the abolition of manhood suffrage in Germany will create a situation instantly calling forth a General Strike, there can on the other hand be no doubt that in the event of our entering a period of stormy action of the masses here in Germany the Socialist Party could not possibly confine their tactics to the merely parliamentary defensive. To determine beforehand the cause and the time of an outbreak of the General Strike in Germany is beyond the power of the Socialist Party, because it is beyond their power to create a historical situation by the means of Party resolutions. But what the Party can and must do, is to indicate the political trend of these struggles, if they once take place, and to formulate a clear, determined policy for their pursuance. Historical events cannot be controlled by prescribing regulations, but by realising beforehand their probable, measurable consequences and by taking action accordingly."

The Lesson of the Russian Revolution. That is my conception with regard to the General Strike and from that you will be able to gather that this conception is far removed from the views held by the Public Prosecutor."

"It has been said that the most aggravating moment in my charge is the fact that in my speech I alluded so frequently to the Russian Revolution. But one cannot help observing that the Russian Revolution is the first great historical experiment with the weapon of the General Strike and that every serious-minded social student, even if he happens to be a bourgeois scholar, must turn to the Russian Revolution for the purpose of gaining practical knowledge."

"A further point mentioned was the composition of the audience, whom I am accused of having incited to the use of physical force. Why, I did not even speak at a public meeting, but at the Socialist Congress; I spoke therefore to an assembly of men, who comprised a selected number of the enlightened workers of Germany. Hence I think it a really enormous under-estimation of the political maturity and intelligence of the Socialist Propagandists to believe that they could by an inflammatory speech so easily be incited to the use of physical force. Such an aspersions amounts decidedly to a tremendous under-estimation of the enlightening and elevating intellectual influences which 40 years of Socialist propaganda have produced in the ranks of the German working class. And I say openly that I should and could have used the identical expressions even at a public meeting without having caused the remotest idea of using physical force in the minds of the workers. Why, has the German Proletariat not proved sufficiently during the last few decades how completely it

has attained its political maturity, how capable it is of its passions in face of the meanness of provocations to riot. And the workers are provoked to rebellion daily.

Real Organisers of Riot. Do you believe that masses of people could be incited to use physical force against the ruling class merely by a few words on the Revolution, when you consider that these same masses kept their temper admirably all the time the capitalist class enforced their anti-Socialist law, their penal servitude enactment directed against free speech and press, their measures for increasing working-class starvation, and, last but not least, their Bill for smothering up the workers' economic organisation? I am surprised that the Public Prosecutor has not, instead of prosecuting me, brought to book the originators of those laws and Bills, for these deeds are apt to stir up immensely the propertyless masses and would most certainly lead to physical force excesses if—yes, if it were not for Socialism's enlightening and elevating influence.

"The Public Prosecutor opined that I completely repudiate the revolutionary character of my Jena speech. That is a great error. I have spoken in a revolutionary strain and I always speak in a revolutionary way, seeing that our entire Socialist propaganda is revolutionary; but not in the sense so peculiarly interpreted by the Public Prosecutor, who ascribes the Hamburg street riots to the revolutionary effect of Socialist agitation; but in the sense that we aim at a basic revolution of the present social order. And I do not even deny that in that process physical force may become necessary. But I, together with my Party, take up the standpoint that the initiative for using physical force proceeds always from the ruling class, a standpoint that was so ably made clear by our great teacher, Frederick Engels, who in 1892 wrote in the columns of the *Neue Zeit*:

"The Bourgeois have very frequently suggested to us that we should under any circumstances abandon the use of revolutionary means and remain within the limits of the law now that the exceptional Socialist law has been dropped and the common law has again been made accessible to all, even to the Socialists! We regret being unable to oblige the gentlemen of the bourgeoisie by taking that hint and hasten to remind them that at this very moment it is not us who destroy 'the legal means.' No, on the contrary, they—the bourgeois—are doing propaganda work for us so effectively that we should be fools were we to interfere with them whilst they are making such wonderful progress. There is evidently some justification for the question whether it will indeed not be the bourgeois and their government who will violate laws and rights, in order to demolish us by physical force. We are prepared to wait. In the meantime 'kindly have the first shot, gentlemen of the bourgeoisie!' They will no doubt fire the first shot. One fine morning the German bourgeois and their Government will grow tired of watching with folded arms the overflowing river of Socialism, and they will take recourse to lawlessness, to physical force. What will be the use of it? Physical force may repress a small section of the people in a limited district, but the power has still to be discovered that is capable of annihilating a Party of two or three million persons spread over a very large country. The counter-revolution, a momentary overpowering of the workers, may perhaps delay the triumph of Socialism for a few years, but only that it may finally prevail so much more completely and definitely."

"This is our conception. And now in conclusion I ask you to acquit me; not because I am afraid of the imprisonment to which you may treat me. If it is a question of enduring the punishment meted out to us by the ruling class for our convictions, every Socialist submits to it with the greatest indifference. But I ask you to acquit me, because my conviction would be an injustice and would cause aggravation in Socialist circles."

After an hour's deliberation Rosa was found guilty and sentenced to 2 months' imprisonment. Well done, "red Rosa"; you have grandly expressed the sentiments of the class-conscious workers of the world and may you live to see the Social Revolution accomplished!

H.J.N.

A LOOK ROUND.

On January 1st all orthodox persons are supposed to make resolutions: which they devote the remaining days of the year to breaking. Reformers of all shades are amongst the orthodox, regarding the members of the S.P.G.B. as unorthodox, "visionary," "outside the political pale," etc. I would suggest that these folk take a resolution to ignore the things that do not matter, and to devote their energies to the only thing that does, viz., the class ownership of the means of wealth production, and the consequent enslavement and poverty of the wealth producers.

If the reformers could show any effective "reforms" as the result of their efforts; if they could prove that any "reforms" they may have been instrumental in securing have made any real difference to the condition of the working class, one would be inclined to bear with them, but when there is abundant testimony to the failure of their efforts, to the waste of all the money they have spent, the time and energy they have devoted to the particular phases of the social problem which find favour in their eyes, one gets a little impatient. However, I will be calm and will only bid them take to heart the truth, as expounded in the following paragraph, extracted from the columns of that most respectable organ, *The Times*, of Christmas Day, in its comments upon the reports by medical inspectors of the Local Government Boards.

"The stories told, it says, are monotonous, and, in most instances, the particulars are disgusting. . . Houses unfit for human habitation, rooms destitute of light and ventilation, overcrowding in rural cottages, contaminated water supplies, accumulations of every description of filth and refuse, a total absence of drainage, a reign of unbelievable dirt in milk-shops and slaughter-houses, and an inadequate supervision by officials who are frequently incompetent; such, in a general way, is the picture that is commonly presented."

Reading an article from the pen of Mr. E. Belfort Lax in *Wilshire's Magazine*, written from the National Liberal Club, England, a correspondent in America asks how the S.D.F. can square its assertion that the Liberal Party must be smashed with the fact that it allows its prominent members to belong to Liberal Clubs. We know it is usual to ask riddles at the festive season, but, owing to the ravages of the prevailing epidemic, we regret we are not up to finding the solution.

According to the *Reader*, one of the most prized possessions of Lord Tweedmouth is a half-crown. It is set in a frame, and underneath are the words, "Honestly earned." We congratulate his Lordship upon being so candid as to admit that out of his large income he has only "honestly earned" one solitary half-crown in his life, and that was by accident.

Mr. Ben Cooper (Liberal) and Mr. Harry Quelch (S.D.F., and supporter of Liberal candidates) will represent the London Trades Council at the Labour Party Conference at Belfast this month.

Mr. R. Bell, M.P., addressing a meeting of the Derby Trades Council recently, said that he certainly had said "For God's sake let us keep politics out of our unions," and he was still of the same opinion. Later he declared that they had had more advantages for Labour during the past year from the Liberals than they had ever had or were likely to have from any Conservative government. His position was and always had been one of strict neutrality, but he invited them to give the Liberal Government credit.

If Mr. Bell believes in keeping politics out of the unions, why does he so continuously use union meetings to boom the Liberals and Richard Bell, M.P.?

In these days when wealthy and titled personages are entering the "Labour" movement, and, because of their wealth and their titles, being pushed to the front by the middle-class dominators of that movement; when "Labour" "copy" is "good copy" in capitalist journals and magazines, the working class will need all their wits to prevent side-tracking. There is something to ponder over in the words put into the mouth of an Anarchist plotter in a story in the December *Harper's*.

"Don't you know yet that an idle and selfish class loves to see mischief being made, even if it is made at its own expense? Its own life being all a matter of vestment and gesture, it is unable to realise the power and danger of real ache and of words that have no sham meaning. It is all fun and sentiment. It is sufficient, for instance, to point out the attitude of the old French aristocracy towards the philosophers whose words were preparing the Great Revolution. Even in England, where you have some common sense, a demagogue has only to shout loud enough and long enough to find some backing in the very class he is shouting at. You too like to see mischief being made. The demagogue gets the amateurs of emotion with him. Amateurism in this, that and the other thing is a delightfully easy way of killing time, and of feeding one's own vanity—the silly vanity of being abreast with the ideas of the day after tomorrow. Just as good and otherwise harmless people will join you in ecstasies over your collection of old china, without having the slightest notion in what its marvellousness really consists."

With the advent of these "aristocratic" and "millionaire" Socialists in increasing numbers, more strenuous efforts are made by their "fellow conspirators" to make Socialism appear ever so respectable. "Hide the Red Flag," says one section; "Don't hold meetings on Sundays," says another; "Deny the Class War," and so on. And here is Gaylord Wilshire, one of America's "millionaire Socialists," repeating the old twaddle that "The phrase 'capital versus labour' continually gives rise to the popular misconception that labour is against capital, or rather that the Socialist is against capital. Not at all. The Socialist is against the private ownership of capital, but certainly not against capital itself."

The Socialist who understands the position is out for the abolition of capital. This was dealt with in our issues of April and August last.

"There are many Socialists who assert that 'the armed nation,' so called, should supplant the standing armies of capitalism, but the experience of Switzerland doesn't bear out the theory. A recent meeting of Socialists in the Canton of Zurich was held to protest against the employment of troops in suppressing strikes. They claimed that in no country in Europe, Russia not excepted, were troops so constantly used to put down strikes and suppress picketing, and stated that 'military outrages against peaceful strikers are becoming matters of daily occurrence.' Switzerland's military establishment is based on the 'armed nation' principle."

In the Report of Mr. D. Cummings and his Executive of the Boiler Makers' Union, on the failure of the Clyde Strike, and the defeat of the men, occur these words: "On account of our railway shares not being saleable without great loss, and the difficulty of disposing of the Preference shares of Armstrong, Whitworth, and Co., we were momentarily in financial difficulty, but our bankers advanced us temporarily a large sum of money at the current interest, and were prepared to advance us still more had the strike gone on."

The capitalist Press are continually booming the "thrift" of the working class, as evidenced by their savings in trade unions, friendly societies, building societies and the like. But in a time of need, such as the strike under review, these savings are useless unless "at

cell." As they are invariably invested in capitalist enterprises they are not available when needed, except under the disadvantageous circumstances referred to in the Report. A combination of financiers could, at any time, paralyze the trade unions, by dealing with their investments on the Stock Exchange in such a manner as to render them useless.

The capitalist cat has at least the proverbial number of lives, and is not going to be killed by a little Trade Dispute Act, despite the junketing of S.D.F., I.L.P., and Liberal-Labour men, who forgot their differences and ate, drank, and were merry together at the Shackleton Banquet last month.

J. Kay.

THE REAL ROOSEVELT.

SEEN THROUGH AMERICAN EYES.

There is not a more pliant tool of the robber classes on earth to-day than Roosevelt. He has made a great splurge about the trusts, probably with their knowledge and consent. The trusts know that it is necessary to do something to fool the people again, and so the various fake laws have been enacted, not one of which will in any manner interfere with the robbing process. None of these laws will be of any benefit to labor or enable the toiler to get a job without begging for it. They are enacted for the sole purpose of fooling the people into the belief that Roosevelt is the friend of the workers.

Every outrage perpetrated upon the toilers since Roosevelt has been President, has had his hearty approval and the perpetrators have been rewarded by Roosevelt with office and emoluments. He looked on while 300 American citizens were dragged from their homes at night and deported from their State without the least shadow of law or authority, and their families left to starve. He has appointed to office some of the vilest criminals of the country, and made a man member of his Cabinet who confessed that he had violated the interstate law every day for ten years. He is the sworn enemy of union labor, having destroyed every vestige of unionism in the government service and has made the government printing office an open shop.

In the pretended "reform" laws passed by the late session of Congress at Roosevelt's suggestion, every provision of the law will be for the benefit of the trusts, and will in no way help the people to ward off robbery and oppression. In the meat inspection law, the government pays enough every year to build the finest kind of sanitary packing houses to kill and pack all the meat of the country. This is a gracious gift of the people's money of three millions per year to the Beef Trust, and yet some people actually believe that the law was enacted for the people.

The same is true with the rate bill. Every provision is for the further enrichment of the railways, and not a single provision that will in any way curb the greed of the Railway Trust or make charges reasonable. The clause giving the federal courts the right of review absolutely abrogates any benefit that otherwise might have accrued to the people. No shipper, unless he be a millionaire, could afford to institute proceedings to regulate rates, and then it would take a lifetime to carry the case through the various courts. The railways got all they wanted in the law, the right to review for their tools whose seats were bought for them upon the federal bench. Every man appointed to the federal bench in the past twenty years has been so appointed at the dictates of the corporations. These men are there to serve their masters, and the people need look for no relief from them.

A good specimen of these corporation tools is given in ex-Senator Quarles of Washington. This villain was repudiated by the overwhelming condemnation of the people of his own State, and, immediately after he is appointed by Roosevelt to the Circuit Court of the same State, there to have in his hands the lives, liberty and property of the same men and women who had set upon him the seal of their condemnation. And this is "Teddy, the Trust Buster."

What a h— of a defender the people have in the White House!

About the choicest claim, however, of Mr. Lewis, is that Roosevelt was boosted into the White House "against black leg money." For whom was the half million of insurance money stolen from the widows and orphans of the great life insurance companies? Every dollar of it spent for Roosevelt's election. If he was not elected by "black flag" money, then no President ever was.

The Interstate Commerce law formerly had imprisonment as one of the penalties of its violation. When evidence began to be produced of the flagrant violation of this law by the railways, at the head of whom was Paul Morton, a member of the Cabinet, Steve Elkins introduced a bill repealing the imprisonment clause. The bill passed both houses of Congress, and ROOSEVELT SIGNED IT. Rebating is the most dastardly of crimes. It is the crime by which Rockefeller has made his millions, from the sweat and blood of the people, and Roosevelt deliberately conspired to repeal the only penalty for this crime which the robbers care a fig for.

Deadwood Lantern.

GUS HAS A SHOCK.

Gus: You Socialists ought to be grateful for the glorious institution of the free Press instead of criticising the great newspapers as you do.

Will: Grateful to whom? The so-called Freedom of the Press is, in reality, painfully limited; but such as it is, it was granted because absolutely necessary to commercial development. Material interests dictated it; not any love of the people. The capitalist class give us nothing but what it is to their interest to give, either to increase their profits or stave off their defeat, and we know from bitter experience that we have most to fear when our enemies profess a regard for us.

Gus: But can you deny that the great daily newspapers are glorious and beneficent institutions, fearlessly standing out for truth and purity in public life?

Will: I emphatically and entirely deny every word of it!

Gus: Do you mean to say that the modern press is not free, or that it suppresses or perverts the truth?

Will: I mean to say that the modern newspaper, by its very nature as a commercial venture, cannot exist except by perverting the truth; and that it is absolutely the slave of capitalist interests.

Gus: You surprise me. Explain yourself.

Will: With pleasure. Now, newspapers are run by limited liability companies to obtain a profit, are they not?

Gus: That is so.

Will: To get a profit they must sell; to sell they must please, to please they must suit themselves to the prejudices, ignorance or interests of their supporters.

(Gus opens his eyes.)

Will: They cannot, then, afford to continue any line of policy when it does not pay, or when it is unpopular with the public or with that section of which they have constituted themselves the mouthpieces. To get the largest circulation and the greatest percentage of profit they must say what their readers or supporters want them to say, or else go under.

(Gus looks startled.)

Will: Nor is that all; they have an even more important person to cater for, the advertiser. He is partly satisfied if the journal panders successfully to a large number of the public; but as a manufacturer he has important capitalist interests, and therefore would not support, by his advertisement, any journal that, through a love of truth, attacked his interests in any way.

(Gus looks frightened.)

Will: Further; the various sections of the capitalist party have enormous campaign funds, and the newspapers, being run for profit, must slavishly support their capitalist party interest or forego their reward. And the journalists who run the papers are the wage-slaves of the proprietors, compelled to utter, not what they think, but what their employers consider will sell best, and will please most the capitalist interest.

Gus tries to hide himself. Will holds him back.

Will: Don't run away, I've not done yet. The modern newspaper is thus, in the main, the reflection of the commonest, most superficial and most servile opinions of the public, and at the same time the advocate of the interests of its capitalist owners and advertisers. It is, therefore, against the financial policy of the modern newspaper to enlighten the working class, particularly in any direction that runs counter to capitalist interests. To satisfy its principal clients the great advertisers and the political leaders, it must expound the views of the ruling class or of a section thereof, and so doctor those views that the people may easily swallow them. It must, whenever the workers show a tendency to see clearly, carefully draw the wool over their eyes in order to keep them at the tail of the capitalist party and ignorant of the things that should concern them. For the rest, in order to earn its profit, the newspaper must batten on the ignorance and folly of its public.

Gus (who feels that the scales have fallen from his eyes): Well, but how can we alter it?

Will: Only by abolishing the profit system. But we can help this on by doing all in our power to spread enlightenment among the workers and so show them the utter worthlessness of capitalist journalism; we can help by organising the workers for the overthrow of capitalist domination, and by pointing out that it is their duty to support a press of their own, not run by an individual or company for profit, but owned and controlled by a genuine working-class organisation for the propagation of definite working-class principles. Thus alone can the education and emancipation of the working class be accomplished, and the freedom of the Press from the curse of profit and capitalist domination become a fact.

F.C.W.

SOME PUBLICATIONS.

MORE BOOKS TO READ ON Social and Economic Subjects. The Fabian Society. One Penny.

A list of books which the Editors think are likely to be required by Socialists and Social Reformers. The Editors do not pretend to have examined all the books catalogued, nor are they prepared to assert that the works are correctly classified, nor can they hope that there are no omissions, nor that every book named is rightly included. In these circumstances the pamphlet may conceivably be useful to the student who finds in it the information he wants!

THE REFORMERS' YEAR BOOK. Paper, 1s., Cloth, 2s., net.

For 1907 this well-known annual contains those useful compilations of facts and figures which we have come to expect in it and which we, as exponents of the revolutionary method are able to use so effectively against the reform advocate for whose purposes, as the title signifies, the book was specially designed. Nevertheless its Editors have so far as in them lied, endeavoured to confine its scope to the records of reform agitation and reform parties and the views of those who are steeped to the eyes in unalloyed revisionism, if such a term is permissible as descriptive of methods essentially the result of the adulteration of the revolutionary idea. Therefore it is fitting that while such reform organisations as the S.D.F., the League of Young Liberals, the Young Scots' Society, the Patent Law Reform Association and the Women's Social and Political Union and the rest of the bodies which go to make up the vilest packet of political ineptitude that was ever flung at the heads of a long suffering democracy, find adequate inclusion, and while the words of the sundry and divers mouthpieces of these bodies stand boldly up upon many a page there is no reference to the revolutionary S.P.G.B. or its work. However, as we say, the book contains much that is interesting and useful to the discriminative propagandist of Socialism and if it also contains much that is of no consequence such as the articles on the Decay of Liberalism, the proposed woman's suffrage agitation, "Some Urgent Reforms," "A Campaign for London," and so on, we cannot help it.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, subscriptions for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, articles, correspondence and advertisements submitted for insertion therein should be addressed.—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 28, Curator St., London, E.C., to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD is published on the first Saturday in each month.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office every Tuesday at 7 p.m. The Office is open every Saturday until 4 p.m.

Terms of Subscriptions.

UNITED KINGDOM.		
Twelve Months	...	1s. 6d.
Six Months	...	9d.
AMERICA.		
Twelve Months	...	50 cents.
Six Months	...	25 cents.

Scale of Charges for Advertisements.

	£	s	d.
Per Inch, One Insertion	...	0	2
Quarter Column do.	...	0	5
Half Column do.	...	0	10
One Column do.	...	1	0

Special arrangements will be made for Advertisements to be inserted in more than one issue.

The Socialist Standard,



SATURDAY, JAN. 5, 1907.

1907.

ANOTHER year with all its opportunities—gone. Another year with all its possibilities—opening upon us. And “a happy new year” comes lightly from the tongue in conventional salutation. “A happy new year”—and doubtless behind the greeting there is still some measure of real concern for the materialisation of the wish in the person addressed. “A happy new year”—why not? Why should not happiness be in the constant experience of all? Why should not happiness be the normal condition of everybody? Why should it not be as natural for everybody to exult in the joys of living as it is for them to breathe—why is it not?

Because happiness is conditioned by the available supply of the necessities of life. Deny these to a man and he cannot be happy. And the barest of these necessities are unobtainable (upon capitalist authority—unobtainable) by at least a third of the people of this, the most prosperous of nations, while the rest of its working population—the population that builds up the “national” prosperity—only just manage, with infinite labour and anxiety, to maintain themselves in a condition of working efficiency.

That is the reason why happiness is not the normal condition of the working population. That is why they have not been happy in the dead year. That is why they cannot be happy in the year just commenced. To wish them “a happy new year” which we know they will not get is therefore rather dreary humour and about as useful as wishing the moon were green cheese.

The Might Have Beens.

And yet it might have been otherwise had capitalist development been a few more years advanced. We might have given our new year's greeting to our neighbour from out of a glad certainty that the happiness we wished was easy of attainment to every worker—had economic conditions ripened a little more rapidly. For between the working class of all countries and those things upon which their happiness depends the barrier is weak enough

to-day to be broken through with ease and swiftness. All that is required to-day is an understanding by the working class of their own strength and the fragility of the opposition set against them—no more than that. Economic development has reached a point when, for all practical purposes, production is being carried on by associated wage workers exclusively, with a minimum of waste. The capitalist has served his purpose in the concentration and organisation of industry. He is now merely the recipient of the wealth produced and is only able to maintain his position by virtue of his ownership and control of the machinery of production and distribution. The working class have but to understand that and determine upon the appropriation for themselves of the wealth they produce themselves and their happy new year's greeting to one another takes no longer of the grotesque.

The Work Before Us.

Well. The important thing seems to be to emphasise that single, simple fact. We can do no more. To pretend that we can would be to delude and confuse; just as it would be a confusion and a delusion to affirm that a happy new year is possible to the working class before they have eliminated the capitalist. As the organ of The Socialist Party of Great Britain, it has been our purpose to drum into the minds of our fellows of the working class the simple fact referred to. We claim that we have done that consistently, refusing to permit the introduction of any element calculated to weaken the effect of our insistence or confuse the object of it. We can do no more in the new year—and we will do no less.

We start with the same enthusiasm that has carried us on from the commencement. We have no new resolutions to make, no new leaves to turn over. We have no delusions for ourselves or for others—and as the British wing of the International Socialist Army we shall continue to relentlessly fight all those, however they may label themselves, who attempt to delude or whose work has that effect. We know that we are right, that our methods are sound; that our cause must triumph, and—we are content.

Sodom and Gomorrah and the Rand.

GREAT consternation in London town. Conformity shocked. Nonconformity staggered. The national conscience stirred. The Oriental vices of compounded Asiatics have, under conditions of celibacy, broken out, and—who'd have thought it, cries Conformity; and—just what we expected, answers Nonconformity; and—something shall and must be done affirms the national conscience; and—leave it to us says the Government; we will do everything that should be done, on our honour as a government we will.

Such agitation! Yet this grossly abhorrent form of sexual excitement is bound to manifest itself where men are herded together under penal conditions and excluded from the society of their women folk. And this was quite well known both to the Conservatives who now protest that “they never did and hadn't the slightest idea,” as well as to the Liberals who knew all the time don't-you-know—and issued licences for 16,000 more Chinese to be imported into the same conditions.

Lust and Luxury.

Nor is the vice peculiarly Asiatic, as the distinguished gentlemen who make our laws and fill our newspapers for us would have us believe. It is not the special affliction of the heathen

Chinese. It is far more widely practiced among the decadent whites of Western civilisation than our pastors and masters are prepared to admit. It is not unknown even in the most exalted circles of good old England. It is a flourishing product of that low moral caste, the accompaniment of unbridled luxury, which continually seeks the gratification of its sensual lusts and finds it only in the grossest of sensations.

The Chinese under normal conditions are a singularly moral people in a rather more ample sense than that word is usually used and their deterioration generally commences with their association with the capitalist method of more “advanced” nations. The faculties which they possess in a remarkable degree of absorbing new influences and assimilating new ideas may have resulted in those of them who have had the misfortune to be translated into the atmosphere of modern commercialism, acquiring the evil practices of their new conditions. But an argument of that sort is very much a two-edged weapon. The evils must have existed to be absorbed.

Morality and Profits.

But all this apart, the consequences as we say, were well known and they were deliberately burked because Rand capitalism demanded cheap labour in order that large profits might be scooped. The Tory Party have the credit of introducing Coolie labour into South Africa. The Liberal Party got in largely by their outcry against conditions of “slavery under the British Flag.” Swearing they would never consent to the degradation of “the national honour” they consented. Swearing a new oath that they had never said the conditions under which the Chinese were being imported were conditions of slavery—that the use of that phrase was a terminological inexactitude—they maintained a continuity of policy and were directly party to the intensification of the evil to the extent of nearly a score of thousands additional licenses. And now that by an unlucky chance the murder is out they are endeavouring to shuffle out of their responsibility by pointing the finger of contumely at the Tories and saying, I told you so.

Cant and Humbug.

All of which, however, is simply part of the Party game. The central fact is that powerful capitalist interests demanded cheap Coolie labour and capitalist governments, Liberal and Tory, satisfied the demand. Now that the moral fester has broken and spurted its putrefaction abroad it may happen that pressure of the “national conscience” deftly played upon by other capitalist influences may effect some alteration. But whether such alteration will be any less hypocritical than the grotesquely farcical steps which the Liberal Government took to relieve any “heathen Chinese” of the obligations of his contract, is a moot point to be determined by the quality and quantity of the opposition aroused by the at present suppressed Bucknill Report. But whatever happens one thing is sure—facilities for obtaining the necessary supply of cheap labour, white, black or yellow, for capitalist purposes, will always be given by capitalist governments, and although it may be possible to suppress some of the more repulsive manifestations of the workings of the profit monger, it will not be possible while capitalism lasts to clear out the cesspool of iniquity which is the profit monger's inevitable accompaniment. Only by the eradication of Capitalism itself and the substitution for it of that system of Society connoted by the term Socialism will that be possible. The disease is directly traceable to the impoverishment and enslavement of the many and the riotous luxury of the few made possible by the private ownership of the means of wealth production. For Asiatic vices so-called as well as all the other unsavory products of the present system, Socialism alone is the remedy.

AT RANDOM.

Justice (24/11/06) is bitterly disappointed with the “Labour” members. They have never, it says, “risen to the level of their opportunities.” “We have not had a single Socialist speech in the House since Parliament opened last February.” They (the “Labour” members) have “perfectly acquired the House of Commons manner . . . and have quite the air of statesmen and legislators. But that is not quite what they were elected for. If they have got hold of the idea that a Labour Party is to be a second-rate imitation of the Liberal or Tory Party, they have quite mistaken their mission.” And more of the same sort.

All very smart and all very nasty. If THE SOCIALIST STANDARD had said the same thing it would have been abusive and blackguardly. However, as Justice has introduced the matter, I hope I may not be thought too forward if I enquire as to Justice's and the S.D.F.'s own particular member. I mean, of course, Will Thorne. What's he doing? And if he isn't now to be distinguished from the rest of the “Labour” members and the “Labour” members are not to be distinguished except by their awkwardness from the members who are not “Labour,” what's the S.D.F. doing?

There were times when the S.D.F. plumed itself upon the hold it kept upon members elected to public bodies. Why hasn't it kept a hold on Will Thorne? Is it because it fears to estrange Will by criticism? Is it because it fears the loss of its only member? Is it because Thorne is not the S.D.F.'s member and therefore not amenable to S.D.F. influence?

The reply I give is an affirmative to all the questions. The S.D.F. cannot afford to lose Thorne or Thorne's influence. Thorne is not amenable to S.D.F. instruction although a member of the S.D.F. Thorne was elected as the L.R.C. candidate and is paid as such. The S.D.F.'s claim on Thorne is only persevered in because the S.D.F. only has Thorne's M.P.-ship to swagger with. It makes an important thing of its very remote association with Thorne so as to make the most it can for itself out of Thorne's electoral success. It's pitiable but there it is.

And now it displays the fraudulent nature of its claim by showing that it has no claim on, and is without influence over, its own alleged member. It means just that; or this—the S.D.F. has lost the last excuse for its existence. By which I mean to say that if S.D.F. members are so little educated upon the duties and responsibilities, the organisation and the discipline which the acceptance of Socialism involves that they do not insist upon their fellow members, into whatever public position they may go, following closely the line marked out by the Party as a whole, then there is no purpose in the organisation and it may as well be dead. If the Party has not insisted because it has no clearly defined line to follow, then again it may as well be dead in name as it is in fact.

John Burns, according to the German Press, has declared that he is not a State Socialist. I agree. Whatever else he is—and I could suggest quite a number of names that would fairly fit—he is not a Socialist, State or otherwise.

John has since stated that he has no recollection of saying anything of the sort, but he will not contradict the newspaper report because he never contradicts anything that is said about him. I disagree. John's memory is statesman-like—and short. He would contradict fast enough—if it paid.

Preaching in Westminster Abbey recently, the Rev. A. Taylor, M.A., said that the elevation of womanhood in all lands was due to the teaching of the Bible! Is this merely the ordinary ignorance of “culture” or has the pro-

nouncement anything to do with the fact that the reverend gentleman is the Secretary of the British and Foreign Bible Society?

Another ecclesiastical dignitary, the celebrated Father Bernard Vaughan, has replied to another Bernard, yept, Shaw. In his reply the worthy Father has well maintained his reputation for sensationalism in three statements. (1) That in Shaw's lecture on religion he was “unable to detect a shadow of scientific thought.” (2) That the prayer that rose to his lips after reading it was “Father, forgive him, for he knows not what he does,” and (3) that Shaw would find “eminently satisfactory results” from an enquiry into “the tenets of the Roman Catholic Church.”

I did not know that the father's investigation into “Smart Set” morals qualified him to pronounce authoritatively upon scientific thought. Moreover, as he has so well pointed out, the tenets of the church to which he belongs are eminently satisfactory to—those who know not what they do! and it would seem, only those. However, statements one and two are all right a coincidence in the circumstances quite sensational.

After “Rocks Ahead,” “Another Political Wreck.” Should the third effort not be entitled “Saved from the Sea”? I throw out the suggestion for what it may be worth. If the drama is to be well rounded we must have a coming to. The villain might then stand a chance of retrieving his fortunes by playing rescuer and even getting applause at the fall of the curtain. However, I have it on good authority that the reason for the selection of nautical titles has nothing to do with the author being at sea.

Herbert Burrows thinks that his comrade Askew is not worth discussing with; he thinks Askew has deliberately insinuated things against him (Burrows) which are maliciously false; and he holds that if Askew has a spark of decency in him he ought to be ashamed of himself and apologise.

This is distinctly the Burrovian method. If anyone disagrees with Herbert and says so, and particularly if he goes so far as to give good reason for his disagreement, he is (pace Herbert) a fellow of no decency, not to say a thorough paced scoundrel. Herbert, of course, is a gentleman, never uses language that is ungentlemanly and anybody who has known him and his Socialism will admit at once that the Socialist movement ought to be proud of its Burrows. Herbert says so and Herbert ought to know.

I am glad to find Herbert ragging more members of the S.D.F. because to me that is *prima facie* evidence that these members are waking up. When anything of the kind happens, and particularly if in the process the position of Herbert and what I may call the official S.D.F. comes under sharp criticism (as it must) Mr. Burrows can always be relied upon to start in with the “slang.” And it will always be found that the safest and surest sign that he hasn't the rockiest leg to stand upon is when he falls back upon his “past record.” I will, when I get time, turn up some of that record and I think I can surprise the Burrowsite (if there is any such misguided person alive) with a reproduction of some of the gentlemanly language that ethical Herbert has given off.

In the same paper for December 15th, Mr. H. M. Hyndman has an article on the same subject, from which I extract the following:

“No pluck whatever has been displayed. Nothing meaner or more contemptible has ever been done, even by our scurviest enemies, the Liberals, than the wholesale discharges of men from Woolwich Arsenal and elsewhere. What has the Labour Party had to say about this infamous conduct? So far as I know, nothing. Worse still, when Mr. John Burns turned the whole unemployed question, which made his personal and pecuniary fortune, into a farce,

who was it who jumped up in haste to thank him for his fine speech and flatter him to his face for his valuable proposal? No less conspicuous a person than the Chairman at the time of the Independent Labour Party and the Whip of the Labour Party in the House of Commons. Yet not a single man of the whole group dared rise and publicly repudiate such mean talk as utterly unworthy of themselves and their constituents.”

In these last days everybody is mightily concerned to manufacture a particular brand of what is called Socialism to meet the requirements of some particular group of individuals. Every brand requires a distinctive label, and every label demands a separate organisation to push it upon public attention. During the last few days I have come across a “Socialism” for millionaires (this is a strictly proprietary brand, placed on the market as was fit and proper, by that “mad-batter” of the “advanced” movement who owns the Fabian Society), the Guild of St. Matthew brand of “Socialism”; “Socialism for the ‘educated middle class’”; “Tory ‘Socialism’”; I.L.P. “Socialism” (which is realised when land and Capital are nationalised), S.D.F. “Socialism,” which Mr. H. M. Hyndman says is to be achieved for the working class by the class above, and so on.

Amid the din of so many pedlars crying their wares it is grateful to come across a small body of propagandists who advance just a plain, unqualified Socialism as the solution for the problem of poverty which affects one class only—the working class; a Socialism which they preach as members of the working class to members of the working class only on the ground that only the working class matter. At any rate I am grateful to these, The Socialist Party of Great Britain.

Professor Oliver Lodge has given us his articles of faith. He holds that the two greatest requirements of life are companionship and affection. But what about food?

“We are told that our women friends who are agitating for the Limited Bill, are in favour of Adult Suffrage. Then why don't they agitate for it instead of for the smaller measure? I have always held that the best way to get part is to ask for the whole, and that if you ask for part you won't even get that.”

Hear! Hear!! Hear!!! Precisely what we are always pointing out to those who, while professing to want Socialism, prefer to ask for unemployed relief, payment of members and—a citizen army! And one of the men who call us “impossibilists” therefore, is—the writer of the foregoing extract, H. Quelch!

Messrs. Quelch & Co. are most vehement opponents of those who urge in connection with this “Votes for Women” agitation that the best way to secure complete adult suffrage is to get the right of women to the vote conceded; that the only way indeed to the ultimate goal is to proceed by short stages. Mr. Quelch says in effect, and I quite agree with him, that if we must proceed by stages we will at any rate endeavour to make those stages as few as possible, and the best way to do that is not to concentrate upon a stage, because that stage is thereby made, for all practical purposes, the ultimate goal, with the result that progress toward it is again made in stages, but rather to demand the whole so that when a concession is wrung out of the ruling class (and if the concession is material it will have to be wrung anyhow) it will be as substantial a concession as possible. Mr. Quelch says this, at any rate, upon the question of votes for women, and anything else that suits his purpose at the moment, for that matter. Yet when we apply the same process of reasoning to the position taken up by Mr. Quelch and his friends in connection with their palliative proposals, we are quite impossible!

The question of the unemployed is in point. Mr. Quelch knows that only Socialism will solve

the unemployed problem and sometimes says so. Mr. Quelch knows that the capitalist class cannot solve the unemployed problem if they would and would not if they could and sometimes says so. Yet Mr. Quelch heads deputations to the capitalist class who cannot and will not solve the unemployed problem, to ask for relief for some of the unemployed. The result is a farcical drop of relief to a vast ocean of misery, the drop to be administered in homeopathic doses by a contemptible capitalist hack.

And this is not the only result, as Mr. Quelch knows. He knows that the miserable labour derelicts who follow his lead are being deluded by his agitation even as the "suffragettes" are being (as he says) deluded. They are not organised for, or concentrated upon, the ultimate goal. They are not demanding the whole. They are only asking for what Mr. Quelch implies it is absurd to ask for, viz., a very small part of what they want, with the result that they don't even get that. And because they don't understand that the whole is their right; because the leaders of the agitation by their cap-in-hand deputations convey the impression that the little they are asking for is the most they ought to expect; because of this they induce the belief in the working class that the capitalists who finally give the bit of relief are excellent good fellows who are doing their best and who deserve to be supported. In other words the class struggle is obscured, and instead of having advanced a stage in the direction of the ultimate goal, they have at the best remained where they were, and at the very probable worst, have actually retreated a stage.

Therefore it is not in the mouth of Mr. Quelch & Co. to talk down at the "Suffragettes" who are but doing what Mr. Quelch himself does. It is notoriously unwise for the occupants of glass houses to exercise with catapults and it is proverbially grotesque for the man with a beam in his own eye to labour in the endeavour to pluck the mote out of the eye of his—sister! The only safe place from which Mr. Quelch may criticise the one-step-at-a-time in the ranks of The Socialist Party of Great Britain. If he has determined to be consistent for the future I invite him to apply for membership.

Try the quality of the "Labour Leader's" parliamentary writer with me. He is referring to the number of ladies in purple and fine linen who are escorted about the precincts of the House of Parliamentary Gallants and goes on: "The Labour members stand and wonder at it all. Some of them—Barnes, Will Thorne and some others—sternly leave the lobby." Why—if a plain person may ask the question—do they leave the lobby? And how do they do it sternly? Does the sight of the lovely ladies with whom they may not mix give them the waterbrash? Or what? And who are these others who prefer not to leave the lobby? Why do they stay? Is it on the chance of a *tele-act*? In any case are we to conclude that they also serve who only stand and wonder?

Try again. They (the Balfours, etc.) "are very nonplussed by the presence of the Labour men. It is not that our men interrupt them... but they make them feel they are there. Just as they are going to utter their most unreal sentiment they happen to make a half turn, and then—they get a full broadside from the eyes of Keir Hardie." Dear! Dear! How very dreadful! Especially when you are not expecting it. But why doesn't Keir Hardie sit on the other side of the House? He could then fix his man every time, and his man couldn't say a word. Perhaps those eyes would impel the victim to speak the truth. You never can tell. As it is Hardie has to wait for the half turn before he can operate. Surely it cannot be that love of compromise and half measures has led the "Labour" Group to prefer half turns when they might get a full turn for the same effort. A half loaf may be better than no bread, but I have never heard that a half turn is better than a whole stare!

These are examples of the strong meat the

Labour Leader regales its readers with. Its sort of literary wash that may serve to satisfy the unhealthy cravings of some of the I.L.P. now that the novelty of the "Labour" Group has worn so thin that the capitalist Press cannot work good "copy" out of it, but it will scarcely do more than impel a sensation of hilarity (or perhaps of nausea) in sober and serious students of working-class politics. The Labour Leader, taking its cue from the "Labour" leaders, is playing down to the weakest headed of its following. Which, being interpreted, is to say that the Labour Leader is playing it as low and as sloppily as it can well do.

ALGERIA.

CORRESPONDENCE.

[To the Editor of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD.]

IS SOCIETY AN ORGANISM?

Dear Comrade, I have to thank Mr. F. C. Watts for his clear and courteous reply to my query, "Is Society an Organism?" but I regret to say he has told me nothing I did not know before. The evidence which convinces him has so far had no weight with me, and even were the reasons I gave in my last letter the only ones I could urge against the affirmative position, I should still be unconvinced. I do not here assert positively that Society is not an organism; I merely say that so far I have failed to find sufficient evidence to warrant the statement.

I will as briefly as possible review Mr. Watts' reply.

In answer to my proposition that "human society to be an organism must be as complex and contain the same organic parts as its individual members," Mr. Watts refers to the human body. He says: "Each individual cell does not reproduce the same complexity, nor does it contain the same organic parts, as the human body in its entirety."

These words are mostly given in italics. Mr. Watts clinching the matter with "Obviously, then, Mr. Wright is wrong." Considering that he has clearly supported my proposition, the last quoted sentence looks decidedly funny.

My argument was from the entire organism to the cell; Mr. Watts replies by arguing from the cell to the entire organism. My proposition states in effect that the whole is greater than a part; Mr. Watts replies that a part is not so great as the whole. I said in effect that man must be at least as complex as his liver; Mr. Watts replies that a man's liver is not so complex as man himself.

Thus we reach the same conclusion, though Mr. Watts appears to be unconscious of the fact. That conclusion is that, man as an entire organism is at least as complex and contains the same organic parts as his individual members. This it would seem is self-evident; at all events, it is a characteristic common to all organisms with which I am acquainted; yet when I wish to apply the test to Society, as an organism, Mr. Watts assures me I am off my base. If he knows of an organism which is less complex and contains less than its own peculiar organic parts, will he kindly trot it out.

Again Mr. Watts: "though the highest types of human society may be indefinite as compared with the human body, yet they are much more definite than many low forms of organic life."

That is to say, that while individual cells of the human body go to form the complex and definite organism, man; this organism, when in its turn, it stands as an individual cell to another, and presumably, a far mightier organism, can only produce one less definite than itself.

This seems to give a double-handed twist to the statement that the whole is greater than a part, and also appears to be an inversion of the law of evolution.

What I said in reference to the brain, heart, and lungs of Society was based upon the above proposition, and it still appears to me that if Society is an organism, formed by the association of men, it should stand as far above them in organic structure as men do above their individual cells. If it does this, let us have proof; no theological stretching to make fancy fit with fact, but facts all the way up.

It is all very well to say that "the way Society develops depends upon its own peculiar conditions, internal and external," but Society, as an organism, can have no conditions which are not common to its individual parts, and both being in organic relationship, they must be similarly affected by these conditions, though, perhaps, in varying degree. If a man is subject to certain conditions, surely it follows that his individual members or cells are subject to the same conditions. Society, therefore, can have no conditions apart from its component cells.

Mr. Watts, in common with many others, appears to regard Society as a huge, indefinite abstraction; an organism possessing neither an organic nor a stimulating impulse; a dead clunk of intangibility; something apart from, and independent of, man.

Mr. Watts asserts, with others, "that the social organism... adapts itself to the changes in its environment."

Is there any essential factor in human society, except man, which can adapt itself to changes in its environment? Does Society, then, mean man in the mass, and nothing else? If so, then truly, Society, that is, man, can adapt itself to changes in its environment. But is that what Mr. Watts means? If not, what does he mean?

If the term "Society" covers man and his environment, then surely it is absurd to say that Society can adapt itself to changes in Society, for that would be equivalent to saying environment can adapt itself to changes in environment.

In my letter I asked, "Where in nature may be found the animal organism in which, say, one third part doing no useful work in the economy of that organism, grows sleek and fat and is able to keep the other two-thirds, which do all the necessary work, unnourished and undeveloped?"

In his reply Mr. Watts quotes a hive of bees. I asked for an organism, he gives me a colony of organisms, which is extremely liberal of him. But even then, the analogy is not sound. In human society the drones hold and control the means of life; in a hive of bees they do not. In bee society the drones perform a useful function; in human society they do not. There are other points of dissimilarity, but I cannot dwell upon them now.

I think Mr. Watts rather unkind when he refers to me as being "professedly revolutionary." While the majority of the present members of the S.P. were enthusiastically working for the S.D.F., with its long, palliative programme, I stood outside, and told every member with whom I came in contact that palliatives should have no place on the programme of a revolutionary Socialist party.

One of the prominent members of the F and D. Branch, who is now an active member of the Peckham Branch of the S.P., spent some time in proving—to his, not my satisfaction—that the position I held was illogical. Though now holding the view I then expounded, he has never yet apologised.

When I first realised that the revolutionary position was the right one, I believe, though I am not absolutely certain, that there was not a Socialist organisation in existence without a palliative programme. Subject to the above qualification, therefore, I claim, at least so far as organisations are concerned, to have been in thought, though unfortunately not in action, the first revolutionary Socialist in the world. Selah!

As I am very busy and as doubtless your space is as valuable as ever, I cannot now touch upon the other points raised by Mr. Watts. Still asking for logical evidence that Society is an organism, I will conclude by wishing the party every success during the coming year.

Yours fraternally,
H. PHILIP WRIGHT.

THE S.P.G.B. AND THE S.L.P.

Calle Capua 23 entresuelo,
Gijón, Spain.
2/11/06.

Dear Sir, Your use of my name in the last two numbers of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, in a manner calculated to mislead, must constitute my excuse for begging the insertion of these lines in your paper.

You say that I served as official correspondent between the London "Impossibilists" and the Scotch Socialists now organised in the S.L.P. The facts in the case are as follows: At the Blackburn Conference of the S.D.F. in 1902, Comrades Yates and Matheson left me their addresses in order that I might acquaint them with what went on in London. I was not appointed by any section and corresponded on my own. The said correspondence treated chiefly of the position brought about by my expulsion, and of the bringing out of the Socialist. When I left England I asked Fitzgerald to keep in touch with the Scotch comrades. Neither Fitzgerald nor myself represented any section.

I write because you make use of this to build up a case that the S.P.G.B. has sprung out of a London "Impossibilist" section, which is most emphatically untrue, several of your leading members, such as Kent and Neumann, having been at open enmity with the London "Impossibilists" up to and after the London S.D.F. Conference of 1903. These latter, up to the time I left London, recognised the Socialist as their organ, and did their best to push its sale, showing conclusively that they endorsed the attitude now associated with the S.L.P.

Yours faithfully,
PERCY FRIEDBERG.

[To save continually reiterating portions of the article that appeared in our August issue, may we suggest to future would-be critics that it would be well for all concerned if they took the trouble to read that article before rushing into correspondence. In the letter above it is stated that we said that Friedberg was the "official correspondent between the London and Scotch sections." The article says:

At the Blackburn Conference... the so-called "Impossibilist" delegates from Scotland and London met... Friendly relations were established and the understanding arrived at that the London members would work in conjunction with the Scotch members for the adoption of an uncompromising policy by the S.D.F., Friedberg agreeing to act as correspondent.

Not only is there no use of the word "official," but it is distinctly stated in the article that in London there was no special plan or organisation among the "Impossibilists," and therefore there could be no "official" representative in any capacity. So far as his letter goes, Friedberg substantiates the statement in the article, but he

omits one important point, that is, that in addition to Yates and Matheson, he corresponded with Anderson, who had been elected on the Provincial Executive of the S.D.F., and this on matters other than his (Friedberg's) expulsion.

The letter says "it is emphatically untrue" that the S.P.G.B. "has sprung out of a London 'Impossibilist' section," but, unfortunately, does not attempt to state whence it sprang, if not from the London "Impossibilists." Nor is the statement substantiated by the reference to several of our "leading members, such as Kent and Neumann," being opposed to the "Impossibilists." "Several" is not well taken when only two names are given, for in the first case Kent was well known for years for his advocacy of what he called the "Islamadist" policy, and was in fact referred to by Friedberg in the letter sent to the New York People as the one "Impossibilist" returned to the London E.C. at the Blackburn Conference. Neumann is certainly a case in point, but his conversion to our view later on—ending in his expulsion from the S.D.F.—was evidence of the success of our efforts while in the S.D.F., to bring the truth of the situation in front of the members.

Above all is the fact that such well-known "Impossibilists" as Elrick, Fitzgerald, Alec and Margaret Pearson, Woodhouse, etc. refused to join the S.L.P., and helped to build up the S.P.G.B., while the most active member in forming the London S.L.P. was E. E. Hunter, who had been an opponent up to the Blackburn Conference.

The last point Friedberg attempts to make is that the London "Impossibilists" recognised the Socialist as their organ "and did their best to push its sale, thereby showing conclusively that they endorsed the attitude now associated with the S.L.P." which it will be easily seen is an endeavour to build up a case on two different tenses. Firstly the article proves the position "now associated with the S.L.P." is very different to that associated with it previously in certain particulars. Secondly, though it may be said that the tone of the Socialist was different then to what it is now, yet protests were made from London quite early in its existence against its tone. Thirdly, and most important, the pushing of the Socialist was dropped by those "Impossibilists" who refused to be led by the nose as soon as the attempt to swindle them was discovered. Ed. S.S.]

FROM THE FIGHTING LINE.

Branches should see that reports of work, incidents of the local fight, and all matters of Party interest and propaganda value for publishing under this heading, are regularly communicated.

BATTERSEA—"All work and no play," etc. After the heat and burden of the municipal fight, Battersea took a siesta in the form of a concert and dance at historic Sydney Hall, on the 9th ult. (Incidentally, Battersea also took a collection in aid of the Party Organ Fund, which was thoughtful and helpful.) For the occasion Paddington sent over a troupe of mummers who produced an impressive little dramatic sketch, "Wasted Lives," which had been specially written by Comrade Fred. Leigh. Setting the scene in Moscow during the time of the bloody street fighting between Russian workmen in revolt and the brutal forces of autocracy, Leigh skilfully presented the spectacle of a Fabianesque English doctor being driven by the irresistible logic of events from the position of a dilettante anti-revolutionary, into the necessity for taking sides for or against the struggling factory workers with whom he finds himself. He chooses the side of the people and in the final tableau falls with the tiny remnant of a barricade defence who, forced to retreat into the house, make a last stand, and are shot dead by the victorious Cossacks.

Having regard to the narrow limitations of stage space and the almost entire absence of stage properties, Messrs. Leigh, Allen, Charles, Hopley, and Jackson, (not to mention Stage-Manager Lewis) are to be congratulated upon a very meritorious performance.

The musical contributions of Comrades Beale, Stuart, Greenham, Lewis, Passit, Slipper, and others were hugely appreciated, while Comrade Gray took the chair (and the collection) in his own—ahem!—imitable manner.

TOTTENHAM has not the vantage ground that Islington Branch possess in Finsbury Park, but Tottenham are by no means depressed. By dint of sheer hard propaganda work they have during the past season almost doubled their membership, and against the combined efforts of local pseudo-labour parties to squelch them, have not only held their own finely, but carried the fight into their opponents' quarters, to the profound discomfiture of the latter every time. Tottenham are now one of the strongest branches in the Party, and have been able to make a weekly donation to the Central Office of 10/- for some months past.

WATFORD.—From the home of one of the largest branches to the home of one of the smallest. Watford at present is the most distant outpost of the Party (although rumour hath it that even this distinction may shortly be lost); its membership is small and the local conditions are exceedingly difficult for straight Socialist propaganda. The town has probably a larger collection of the one-step-at-a-time-and-the-smaller-the-better parties than any other town of the same size can show, and the unhappy effects of their confusionist work is very marked. A branch of the Party several hundred strong could find plenty of work to engage its constant attention. Yet a very few determined members even under these conditions can make their presence felt, and the little Watford Branch can claim to have done that during the past year. Its manifesto on the local elections back in the Spring made an effective case against the candidates claiming to represent the specific

interests of the working class, with the result that all of them were defeated by large majorities. Sunday open air meetings of a fairly good character have been held throughout the fine weather, and although the seed sown may take longer to germinate under the adverse local conditions, there is no doubt at all but that the work put in will presently bear good fruit. Steady does it at Watford. Better a few members acting as one than a few hundred acting at sixes and sevens.

TOOTING. The Tooting Branch has been very much alive of late, although no report of their doings has appeared for some time.

The Branch decided to contest the local ward at the recent Borough Council Election, hoping that by participating in such a contest in opposition to all and sundry, they would clear away some of the cobwebs from the minds of those who, taking their Socialism from the capitalist Press, labour under the delusion that Socialism is simply Liberalism and Labourism in an advanced form.

The contest also answered those critics who contend that our principles only afford scope for a negative attitude. We entered the field of positive political action, with Comrades Barker, Dumenil, and McManus, and when the wire-pulling in the capitalist camp had run its course we found we had for opponents 3 Municipal Reformers, 4 alleged Independents (really 2 Liberals and 2 Tories running jointly) and 3 "Labour" candidates. We placed our position before the public against the position of all the others without fear or favour, repeatedly challenging anyone to come upon our platform and show any real difference between the other ten. No one attempted the impossible.

We got an advertisement from an unexpected quarter which is interesting as showing the tactics of the confusionists. Speaking for the S.D.F. in Tooting Broadway, on the Sunday before the election, T. Glossop, in the course of his address, without any question being asked, advised the working men of Tooting to vote, not for the "Labour" candidates, but for the three run by the S.P.G.B., who were the only Socialist candidates in the field. Posters were up all over the district at that moment announcing that Mrs. Despard, F. Knee and W. H. Humphreys, all S.D.F.ers, would speak in support of the Labour candidates at Tooting Graveney School on the Monday. We have since heard that Glossop tried hard to induce F. Knee and Humphreys not to address that meeting but without success, for they all kept the engagement. When the public of Tooting want to know why we are opposed to the S.D.F. they can for the future have some local matter as well as national. The gulf between the S.P.G.B. and the "Labour" Party any section should be now apparent to all interested. The Branch got an election address into practically every house and flat in the ward irrespective of the resident being a voter or not. The Labour Party, who are so desirous of educating the workers, ignored the voteless, which is an advantage as the voteless have less to unlearn. We did not canvassing whatsoever, but held plenty of open-air meetings at which we had a little Radical opposition (which was easily dealt with) and a fair number of questions. The public generally showed much more interest in our election meetings than in our ordinary propaganda ones. It may interest some also to know that a considerable influx of new members is one result of the campaign. Tooting is getting a move on to some time, as, in addition to increased membership, the speaking capabilities of the members have improved considerably as a result of the increased practice that they have had. The total cost of the election to us was £3 3s. 6d. and the votes recorded for our candidates were: Barker, 94; McManus, 77; Dumenil, 59. Of these 50 were plumpers.

[Notes from West Ham, Romford, and Paddington held over.]

The Communist Manifesto (referred to by the Public Prosecutor at the trial of our comrade, Rosa Luxemburg [see page 33], can be obtained from the Party Office, 28, Cursitor-st., London, E.C.4, post free, 2½d.

The receipt of a copy of this paper is an invitation to subscribe.

THE INFLUENCE OF PROPERTY IN THE CIVILISATION OF MAN.

"It is impossible to over-estimate the influence of property in the civilisation of mankind. It was the power that brought the Aryan and Semetic nations out of barbarism into civilisation. The growth of the idea of property in the human mind commenced in feebleness and ended in becoming its master passion. Governments and Laws are instituted with primary reference to its creation, protection and enjoyment. It introduced human slavery as an instrument in its production; and after the experience of several thousand years it caused the abolition of slavery upon the discovery that a freeman was a better property-making machine. . . . The dissolution of society bids fair to become the termination of a career of which property is the end and aim; because such a career contains the elements of self-destruction. Democracy is the next higher plane. It will be a revival in a higher form of the liberty, equality and fraternity of the ancient gentes."—*Ancient Society*, MORGAN.

IMPORTANT.

A NEW YEAR'S GATHERING OF PARTY MEMBERS AND FRIENDS

WILL BE HOLDEN

EARLY IN FEBRUARY

IN THE HALL OF

The Communist Club, CHARLOTTE STREET, W.

GREAT PROGRAMME IN PREPARATION.

SONGS, DANCES, etc.

Full particulars will be sent Branch Secretaries shortly.

A STATEMENT dealing with the EXPULSION by THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN of certain members of the ISLINGTON BRANCH of the Party will appear in the FEBRUARY ISSUE of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD.

VOL. II

OF

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

(Sept., 1905 to Aug., 1906.)

Well bound in cloth, gold lettered,

Post Free ... 3s. 0d.

Orders, accompanied by remittance, should be addressed: S.P.G.B., 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

Branch Secretaries and others

SHOULD NOTE THAT

JACOMB BROS.

Can do their printing as Cheaply and as well as anyone else.

JACOMB BROS., Printers,
STRATFORD, E.

Printed by Jacomb Bros., (T.U.), 2a Wingfield Road, Stratford E., for the Proprietors, The Socialist Party of Great Britain, and published at 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

HOLDS

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master-class, and the consequent enslavement of the working-class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working-class from the domination of the master-class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working-class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist-class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working-class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working-class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master-class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

NOW READY.

S.P.G.B. LIBRARY, No. 2.

From Handicraft to Capitalism,

Translated from the German of
KARL KAUTSKY.

The only translation in the English language of this important section of the famous "Das Erfurter Program."

POST FREE ... 1½d.

S.P.G.B., 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

The Head Office of The Socialist Party of Great Britain is at 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

HEAD OFFICE:

28, CURSITOR STREET, LONDON, E.C.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—A. Jones, Secretary, 3, Mathew St., Latchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at Sydney Hall, York Road, Battersea, S.W.
CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Executive Committee. Applications should be sent to the General Secretary.
EAST HAM.—W. Gifford, Sec., 31, Maryland Square, Stratford. Branch meets Mondays at 7.30 at 447, Katherine Rd., Forest Gate.
EDMONTON.—Sidney Auty, Sec., 60, Gilpin Grove, Edmonton. Branch meets alternate Wed. 8.30.
FULHAM.—J. HUMPHRIES, Secretary, 309, North End Road.
ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Fri. at 8.30 at 79, Grove Rd., Holloway. Communications to the Sec.
PADDINGTON.—T. A. Wilson, Sec., 90, Mortimer Road, Kensal Rise, W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m. at Harley's Coffee Tavern (foot of Lock Bridge), Harrow Road.
PECKHAM.—W. Wren, Sec., 91, Evelina Rd., Nunhead, S.E. Branch meets every Wed. at 8.30.
ROMFORD DIVISION.—All communications to the Secretary, S.P.G.B. Club, 39, York Road, Ilford. Branch meets Mondays at 8 at Club.
TOOTING.—P. Dumenil, Secretary, 36, Byton Road, Tooting, S.W. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. at Gorrings Dining Rooms, Gorrings Park Parade, Tooting Junction.
TOTTENHAM.—Branch meets Mondays 8 p.m. at the Sunbeam Coffee Tavern, High Road, E. Stevens, Sec., 88, Chester Rd., West Green.
WATFORD.—T. Wilkins, Sec., 4, Marlborough Rd. Branch meets alternate Fridays at 8 p.m.
WEST HAM.—G. C. H. Carter, Sec., 107, Ham Pk. Rd., Stratford. Branch meets Mondays 7.30, followed at 8.30 by discussion, at 447, Katherine Road, Forest Gate.
WOOD GREEN.—J. Crump, Secretary, 7, Dunloe Avenue, Downhill Park Road, Tottenham, N. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Sundays at 8.30.
WOOLWICH & PLUMSTEAD.—A. E. Rance, Sec., 71a, Marmadon Rd., Plumstead. Branch meets on 2nd and 4th Wednesdays in month at 80, Conway Road, Plumstead.

INFORMATION

concerning the Party can be obtained of the following
BIRMINGHAM.—H. Oldknow, 227, St. Saviour's Road, Salford.

BRADFORD (Yorks).—Ben Wilde, 78, Godwin St.
BURTON-ON-TRENT.—J. Blundell, 157, New St.
LIVERPOOL.—J. M. O. Sullivan, 4, Laburnum Grove, Litherland.

BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, &c. to be obtained of the S.P.G.B., 28, Cursitor St., London, E.C.
CAPITAL (Karl Marx) ... 5s. 6d.
SIX CENTURIES OF WORK AND WAGES (Thorold Rogers) ... 5s. 6d.
POVERTY (Rowntree) ... 4s. 6d.
SOCIALIST STANDARD

Vol. I. (Bound) 3s. 0d.

Vol. II. " 3s. 0d.

Unbound Copies 1 to 12 ... 1s. 0d.

Do. do. 13 to 24 ... 1s. 0d.

MANIFESTO and RULES of the S.P.G.B. ... 1½d.

FROM HANDICRAFT TO CAPITALISM (Kautsky) 1½d.

COMMUNIST MANIFESTO ... 2½d.

WAGE LABOUR & CAPITAL (Marx) 1½d.

JONES' BOY ... 1½d.

SOCIALISM & THE WORKER (Sorge) 1½d.

HOW I BECAME A SOCIALIST (Morris) 1½d.

THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION (Kautsky) 7½d.

ALL POST FREE.

TO THE TRADE.

The following are Wholesale Agents for The Socialist Standard and other publications of the S.P.G.B.
HENDERSON, 16, Paternoster Row, E.C.

JOHN HEYWOOD, Ltd., Deansgate, Manchester.

W. H. SMITH & SON, Blackfriars St., Manchester.

RETAIL AGENTS.

JACQUES, Old Street, E.C.

TUCKWELL, 160, Fonthill Road, Finsbury Park.

VESPERMAN, 251, Gray's Inn Road, W.C.

WREN, 91, Evelina Road, Nunhead, S.E.

ROOK, 9a, Cursitor Street, E.C.

GRANT, Ilford Hill, Ilford.

SIMPSON, 209, Leytonstone Road, Stratford, E.

BREWSTER, 153, Barking Rd., Canning Town.

WARNE, 1a, Queen's Square, Upton Park, E.

MENHINICK, 40, King William St., London B'dge.

FOX, 18a, New Kent Road, S.E.

The
Official Organ
of
The
Socialist Party
of
Great Britain.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

No. 30. VOL. 3.]

LONDON, FEBRUARY, 1907.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

THE SOCIALIST PARTY AND TRADE UNIONISM.

At the adjourned meeting held at the Communist Club, May 26th, with Comrade Gifford in the chair Comrade Fitzgerald moved:

Under term of reference No. 1

That as under capitalism the workers sell their labour power—inseparable from themselves—as an article of merchandise, and being subject to the same economic laws which prevail in other commodity markets, it is necessary for the workers to debate the fluctuations in price with the employers. Organised action being more advantageous than individual action, be it—

Resolved that the S.P.G.B. holds that Trade Unionism is a necessity under capitalism, to prevent the workers being continuously driven to sell their labour power below its value.

Under term of reference No. 2

That as the establishment of Socialism will mean "the administration of things instead of the government of people," as Engels said, and as the administration of the various detail processes of wealth production can only be carried on effectively by those possessing the requisite technical knowledge being organised for that purpose, be it—

Resolved that the S.P.G.B. holds that Trade Unionism is necessary for the establishment of Socialism.

If term No. 3 be considered

That as the position of the workers in modern Society is one of a propertyless class in opposition to the propertied capitalist class, the form of organisation adopted in the economic field must of necessity be based upon this class position as a first principle, while, for the reasons given under resolution No. 2, the chief detail unit of organisation must be the trade or occupation, be it—

Resolved that the S.P.G.B. holds that the form of organisation must have a class basis as first principle and the trade sub-division as the chief detail of organisation; other sub-divisions, either geographical or economic, to be arranged as circumstances demand.

Under term of reference No. 4

That as the economic arm is required to act in conjunction with the political arm to establish Socialism, and as the only form of organisation which is in harmony with the political basis of Socialism is the one given above, be it—

Resolved that the S.P.G.B. urges forward the propaganda of the economic position laid down in conjunction with its political propaganda both inside and outside the present unions with the object of establishing the Socialist Trade Union required for this work.

The mover said it was not necessary to spend much time here discussing the class basis, as we all realised that it was the lack of class-consciousness which kept the workers divided. The chief detail of organisation must be the trade or occupation because only those in a given trade knew the actual conditions, as was shown in the late strike of *Daily News* compositors. Moreover the other sub-divisions must depend on circumstances. The Leeds Fire Clay Co. in one district employed workers in several distinct industries, such as coal mining, clay working, building and stone quarrying, while the L.C.C. employed building operatives, tramway men, steamboat employees, clerks and draughtsmen. These were instances where the geographical sub-division was necessary, and where the industrial sub-division would be useless. The firm of David Allen & Sons was an example where the industrial sub-division would be suitable, all their employees being in the same industry.

An amendment was moved by Phillips and Kent to delete words from "while" to "occu-

pation," and all words after "class basis."

Kent said to enter into detail questions was premature.

Killick said the question of detail was not essential; Fitzgerald should have made that clear.

Leigh said the question of geographical position did not affect industrialism at all. Are not the clay workers divided into various trades?

T. W. Allen said Fitzgerald's illustration could be applied to the building industry. The Socialist parties had failed to unite the revolutionary working class. The I.W.W. would unite the various parties. It was common sense to say the workers will recognise the political position when they are in an economic organisation.

Neumann opposed the I.W.W.

The meeting then adjourned.

At the adjourned meeting held at the Communist Club June 9th, T. A. Jackson continued the discussion on Kent's amendment.

Jackson said the object of the amendment was stated to be that the movers did not think the particulars entered into in the resolution were necessary. Leigh and Allen had urged that the details should remain in, since they favoured an industrial form of organisation. But neither Leigh nor Allen knew what they meant by industrial organisation. With regard to the objection of Phillips and Kent, he (Jackson) thought it was necessary to give the details. He had recognised that an economic organisation would be necessary. The question Fitzgerald had considered was how far an economic organisation could be made to take on its proper function of supplementing the work of the Socialist Party in accomplishing the revolution. Under certain circumstances it might be necessary to organise on geographical lines, under others it would be necessary to federate the organisations, but those questions would have to be decided at the particular time when action was necessary.

Let us assume that capitalism was tending to that stage of monopoly when industry could be divided into thirteen different trusts. Even then it would be difficult to postulate what the form of organisation should be. To those who said the economic organisation should be industrial he would point out that even the I.W.W. made provision for certain governing bodies called district councils purely geographical divisions. When a strike took place and a portion of the workers went on strike it would depend on the understanding of the workers of the class position as to the action the remainder would take. He did not think it advisable therefore, to adopt any *a priori* scheme of specialisation. The question of federation could only come upon the agenda when a large number of the workers were sufficiently class conscious to perfect their organisation for the revolution.

The amendment was lost by 9 to 5.

Anderson moved the deletion of all the words after "position" down to and including "occupation." The amendment was seconded by Pearson.

The amendment was lost by 9 to 3.

Fitzgerald in reply to the resolution said

Killick had said he did not think it was well to go too much into details in the matter. But we should lay down the broad lines upon which we intended to travel. On a previous occasion he had read out extracts from the I.W.W. convention which showed the position of that party. But T. W. Allen had said that it was yet to be shown that the I.W.W. was not a sound economic organisation. Therefore he had brought along some more extracts dealing with the subject. What he had said about the W.F. of M. in Colorado supporting capitalistic candidates was still further supported by T. J. Hagerty of Butte, Montana. A resolution was proposed to the Executive that the members should not be allowed to support any capitalist candidate or party. Clemens pointed out that that would put many of the members of the W.F. of M. in a very funny position, because some of them were members of the Republican Party. Hagerty said:

"It is true that back in the State of Montana we have a peculiar condition of things. Some five or six years ago I attended a convention of the State labour movement in the city of Helena, in September, 1899. . . . After the party had been organised the capitalist parties commenced to lay plans to seize upon it. We found the Amalgamated Mining Company on one side and Senator Clark and F. E. Heinze upon the other, at war. There was an opportunity that we could not miss. We seized upon the opportunity. Clark wanted to become a United States Senator, and F. A. Heinze wanted something else, and we knew it. I maintain that we did not do to them, but compelled them to come to us, but nevertheless there was a capitalist combination with a labor party, and hence it became capitalistic. We went to the polls and united our movement to theirs. Twelve men went to the legislative body from that county. In the division we got six of the twelve. We got the sheriff of the county, the coroner, and others. I was nominated for the office of county Commissioner and was elected." (Report of I.W.W. Convention, Chicago. —Page 272.)

Some said that the W.F. of M., the backbone of the I.W.W., had in it a portion of the Republican Party in Butte, showing how class-unconscious those members were. When the I.W.W. was formed they sent over to what they called the various industrial organisations in France, and Traulmann got a very fine letter from the General Confederation of Labour in France. Here was the reply of the French organisation:

Our Committee took with pleasure, notice of your Manifesto and call. It is happy at the constitution of your organisation and it hopes that your federative group, which itself planted upon the field of the class struggle, will have at heart the necessity of conducting the battle upon that field where all equivocation vanishes: upon the economic field.

It is not for us to meddle in your internal organisation: it is for you to constitute yourselves according to the lay of the land where you are called upon to struggle. Nevertheless, allow us to observe that the French economic organisations have had cause only to congratulate themselves for having eliminated from their midst all discussions and questions concerning electoral and governmental parliamentarism. In fact, we hold that the political opinions of a workman are secondary to his class interests. Consequently whatever may be the opinion of a workman upon that head his interests are ever supreme and, upon the field of interests, in the revolutionary struggle against capitalism, all opinions can blend into one.

E. POUGET, Secrétaire adjoint. (Report of I.W.W. Convention, Page 289.)

They did not, however, get that sort of reply

from all the organisations on the continent. Another organisation in Denmark made the following reply:

As to our own opinion on the economic organisation we here in Denmark, take the absolute and decided stand that the same must be built—as so well expressed in your Manifesto—upon the recognition of the class struggle in Society. But how that can be accomplished if the unions—as you again proclaim in the Manifesto—will abstain from co-operation with any political party, even with that one which indulges solely in the politics of the working class, we cannot understand. We are of the opinion that everywhere, when needed, the economic organisation and the Social Democratic party must work hand in hand, in order to promote the interests of the working class where the interests of the toilers have to be taken care of. We hold that the passage in your Manifesto where it reads "without affiliation with any political party" has only been inserted to manifest the complete neutrality of the union."

(—Page 290-1.)

The I.W.W. started out with the statement that the present trade unions don't organise the unorganised. Now in the first place we could point to the experience of other organisations to prove that this was all right in theory, but with the exception of the Gasworkers' Union when Aveling was organising it, not one organisation had yet organised the unorganised. The I.W.W. was devoting all its attention to try and capture the already organised workers. Again E. J. B. Allen himself had only found a platform for the statement of his position inside a trade union, the O.B.S.

One of the arguments used by the I.W.W. was that the present trade unions built a Chinese Wall round the union. He (Fitzgerald) belonged to what was called a pure and simple organisation. Now the initiation fee of the I.W.W. was two-thirds greater than that of his organisation. Again, in the O.B.S. he could run six months without paying dues, but the I.W.W. members could only run 60 days. Again the I.W.W. made no provision for seeing to its members when they were out of work. Leigh seemed quite lost as to the base given by the speaker as to the formation of the organisation. He had given the case of the Leeds Fire Clay Co. with various industries working together. True those workers were split up into industries, but the point was that there were all these workers working together in one geographical division, under one roof, so to speak. T. W. Allen said it was a credit to the I.W.W. to discuss for two-and-a-half days the meaning of the industrial sub-division. But the Committee had said at the very beginning that they had laid what they had called the industrial principle, and it was no use discussing it any longer because it was going to be railroaded through. As regards the credit due to discussion, the men who favoured the I.W.W. position had laid it down when they first met that "academic discussion would not be allowed."

A man who refused to recognise, political action was not a true revolutionary. Now if he did not declare himself how could it be known that he was a member of the revolutionary working class? So much for the I.W.W. uniting various "Socialist" parties. We did not attempt to reconcile irreconcilable interests, but attempted to form a sound organisation of the working class.

Again, merely being in an economic organisation would not make the workers recognise their position any quicker. Marx pointed out we could learn lessons from countries more advanced, and one of the lessons we could learn was to profit by their mistakes. We take lessons wherever we can get them, but don't think that what took place in countries more advanced was necessarily right. It often happened that when a strike took place there appeared to be worse conditions when they went back, whereas really they had a slightly better position.

The resolution was carried by 13 to 3.

Fitzgerald, in moving his fourth clause, said for the time being we could do nothing more than be propagandists. How were we going to build up that Socialist economic organisation required? We should act as Socialist propagandists at every place and time. Seeing that we were at present unable to form an economic organisation we should carry on our propaganda and point out the importance of the political organisation to capture that which would determine the real battle, while pointing out the necessity of the economic and political

organisations working together. In this country no real, solid attempt had been made to convert men inside trade unions. Writing in THE SOCIALIST STANDARD not long ago, E. J. B. Allen said the question of carrying on propaganda inside the trade unions had hardly been attempted, yet in a letter to the Peckham Branch he said that long and bitter experience had proved the futility of trying to change the trade unions. He (Fitzgerald) thought it would be easier to get the trade unions to throw off their old form than to get men to come out and form any new body.

Jackson seconded the resolution and said all we could do was to endeavour to create that class consciousness without which a sound economic organisation could not exist. He would like to point out that this position made it clear that we were to propagate this principle, and point out to the workers that they had got to understand their economic organisation could proceed to use the means of production whilst they were controlled and after they had been taken by the political party. De Leon had said in the address on Preamble of the I.W.W., "It is not a political organisation—as the Preamble indicates and I shall prove—that can 'take and hold' the land and the capital and the fulness thereof. That—as the Preamble proclaims and I shall prove—is the function reserved for the economic organisation of the working class."

Anderson said he disagreed with the importance that even in this resolution was being given to the economic side of the question. If we viewed the international concentration of capital all this organisation was proved not only futile but dangerous. We must go on propagating our Socialist principles. We could only teach one great point that the overthrow of capitalism must be the work of the class-conscious workers themselves. If we were going to say we should change the trade unions in the meantime, we must defend those organisations at present—if not we should be pledging ourselves to change in the future an organisation that might disappear in the interim. Why not point out that all economic organisation was futile against the attacks of international capital. Let us carry on our propaganda, and when we have a class-conscious working class we can decide on the most expedient way of establishing the Socialist Republic.

Neumann said Anderson knew full well that those who had been the founders of scientific Socialism had not written in the strain he had spoken in. They had pointed out that the workers should use every means in their power to at least resist the encroachments of the capitalist class. The full teaching of Socialism was not only to teach the working class to go for the transformation of Society, but to form a class-conscious organisation to resist the encroachment of the capitalist class inch by inch. We could not for one moment say that economic organisation under present Society was not just as necessary as political. The resolution showed that we were in favour of economic organisation, but that that organisation should be on Socialist lines.

He wished to either have added to the resolution, or if the mover was not willing to accept the addition to move the following addition:

And as all organisations, economic as well as political, on a basis other than laid down by the Declaration of Principles of the S.P.G.B., are unsound from the standpoint of our Party;

Be it further resolved that the S.P.G.B. is compelled to oppose the formation of any organisation of the workers the membership of which is open to non-Socialists.

We wanted to show that the Socialist trade union should not only be Socialist in name but Socialist in character.

Fitzgerald not accepting the addition, Neumann moved it as an amendment.

The amendment not being seconded, fell through.

W. G. Killick said as the workers became politically revolutionary so they would alter the form of their economic organisations.

Barker said it was just a question of what was the best method of making the workers class-conscious. He believed the best method was by a political organisation. As soon as they became class-conscious they would understand their position perfectly well. Recognising that even trade unions were useful to keep the workers from being driven on the down grade, we could

not prevent our members belonging to trade unions.

J. Crump said Anderson seemed to have misconstrued the purport of the resolution. When we had made the workers Socialists the existing trade unions would also become Socialist trade unions. We were not out for the establishment of Socialist trade unions in particular, but for the propagation of Socialist principles.

Pearson said we were told to go inside our unions and prepare to transform them. To do this he thought was absolutely useless.

Neumann moved the deletion of the words "both inside and outside the present trade unions."

The amendment not being seconded fell through.

Fitzgerald in reply said that at one of the previous meetings it was urged that economic organisation was more important than political, and it had been said that Engels supported that view. Here was what Engels, in his "Socialism Utopian and Scientific," said:

Whilst the capitalist mode of production more and more completely transforms the great majority of the population into proletarians, it creates the power which, under penalty of its own destruction, is forced to accomplish this revolution. Whilst it forces on more and more the transformation of the vast means of production, already socialised into State property, it shows itself the way to accomplishing this revolution. The proletariat seizes political power and turns the means of production into State property.

He used the word "state" there, but there was no ambiguity or lack of clearness, for he went on to say with reference to the word "state":

But in doing this, it abolishes all class distinctions and class antagonisms, abolishes also the State as State. Society thus far, based upon class antagonisms, had need of the State. That is, of an organisation of the particular class which was pro tempore the exploiting class, an organisation for the purpose of preventing any interference from without with the existing conditions of production, and therefore, especially for the purpose of forcibly keeping the exploited classes in the condition of oppression corresponding with the given mode of production (slavery, serfdom, wage-labour). The State was the official representative of Society as a whole; the gathering of it together into a visible embodiment. But it was this only in so far as it was the State of that class which itself represented, for the time being, Society as a whole; in ancient times, the State of slave-owning citizens; in the middle ages the feudal lords; in our own time, the bourgeoisie.

The phrase "the political . . . state property" was italicised. Anderson said the capitalists were organised internationally in such a way as to render economic organisation unnecessary. Marx pointed out in "Value, Price and Profit" that if the workers were not prepared to debate the price of their labour day by day in the labour market, they would not be fit material for a future revolution. Economic organisation would have its place all the while under capitalism. With regard to the "capturing" of the trade unionists, that was the old theory of the I.L.P. playing to the rank and file and patting them on the back. We were going to carry on the work of propaganda for Socialism in the trade unions in an open and above-board manner. Boring from within by the S.D.F. had been very erratic. In the main it had consisted of going in and mentioning Socialism only when there was no danger. It was not a question of capturing the trade unions but of educating the workers inside as well as outside. So long as a member of a union had the evidence for every statement he made and fought openly there would be little danger of his being thrown out. The resolution was carried by 19 to 4.

Motion by Neumann and Carter to rescind Kent's resolution passed at previous meeting.

Neumann said his reason for re-moving the rescindment was that it was not declaring war on the unions so long as we allowed our members to remain in the trade unions. Again how could a Socialist organisation permit itself to be controlled by another organisation? We should be as one body.

Carter concurred.

The resolution for the rescindment was lost by 14 to 12.

Anderson moved the following resolution: That only by political organisation can the workers emancipate themselves.

Anderson said ever since any one of us became Socialist the question had been, not whether or not we were fighting the trade unions, but how we were to fight them. Trade unionism was

concerned with palliating capitalism.

Betta seconded the resolution.

Neumann opposed the resolution, saying that it said something contrary to fact, viz., that the working class could fight the capitalist class without fighting them on the economic field. The adjournment was moved and defeated.

Anderson, in reply, said just as we told the workers in the trade unions they may fight against a reduction but nevertheless they would ultimately have to suffer reductions, we could point out to them that by political action they could overthrow the capitalist system.

The resolution was lost by 15 to 8.

(CONCLUSION.)

ALL "SOCIALISTS" NOW!

In the last issue I gave a few examples of the many brands of "Socialism" made up to suit the political complexions of the various class (and no class) organisations whose members are anxious not to be out of touch with the fashion. As indicative of the growth of the fashion, I notice that in addition to Shaw's "Socialist" plays at the Court Theatre, the Stage Society recently put on that "Socialist" drama, "The Weavers"; also Nelly Neil, the principal character in the musical comedy of that name, is a "Socialist." At the Haymarket in the curtain raiser "Her Grace the Reformer" we have another "Socialist" as the leading part. That well-known "Socialist" mummer, Mr. Jas. Welch is shortly to appear in a new role, while a "Socialist" lady sustains the chief feminine interest in "The Bondman," the author of which is that well-known "Socialist," Mr. Hall Caine.

In good truth we are all "Socialists" now and we, who for so many years were as voices crying in the wilderness, ought to be overjoyed to know that we are now "the thing don't you know." We have been "taken up." We bask in the smiles of the queens of "Society" and count the peerage and the stage (which perhaps are not quite the same thing—yet) among our "comrades." In such circumstances it ill becomes a man to cavil. And yet it seems somewhat incumbent upon me to suggest that there is some little possibility of the indiscriminate failing to locate the wood for the obscuring trees. There are so many "Socialists" to contend with that the wayfaring man is in imminent danger of missing the Socialism he is searching for.

And probably that is one at least of the ideas lying behind some of this seeming enthusiasm for the "Socialist" cult. With so many brands of "Socialism" on the market and so many "Socialist" connoisseurs of those brands, it is no easy matter for the common workman to distinguish between the true and the false. The effect upon his mind must be of a confusion worse confounded. And it becomes an increasingly difficult thing to keep the class line clearly defined while there is, apparently, so much sympathy for working-class ideals existing among the representatives of the class whose interests (according to the exponents of the class struggle) are in such diametrical opposition to the interests of the workers.

There may easily, therefore, be more in this matter than meets the eye. Undoubtedly it is a concern for one's own material interests that lies at the root of all our actions, however unconscious we may be of it. And with the pressure of economic conditions ever tending to impel the working class toward action in their own protection, it becomes obvious to the capitalist class that the workers, upon whose labour they maintain their useless and luxurious lives, must soon awaken to the real causes of poverty. With this awakening must surely come the downfall of capitalism. Wherefore—the dust of a simulated sympathy is stirred into a cloud in the hope that the attention of the workers may be diverted from the real issue.

The more reason then for us to renew our efforts to combat the work and influence of the agents of capitalism in whatever guise they

come. The more reason for us to shout our message from the house tops; to persistently give emphatic voice to our warnings; to stand always pointing the way along which our class must march to their emancipation. Of one thing we are certain: economic development cannot be retarded. And because that is so the confounding work of the representatives of capitalism, however successful it may be to-day, cannot endure. Sooner or later capitalism must definitely and irrevocably take its stand in naked antagonism to the workers. It is our business to do that which other organisations professing Socialism have not done, viz., to insist upon Socialism as the only hope of our class; to show in what Socialism essentially consists; to make clear and keep clear the class division; to demonstrate the real meaning of most of the sympathetic protestations of what are actually anti-working class bodies; in fine, to make of our education work an insistence upon essentials and the clearance of non-essentials to the end that the time may be hastened when capitalism shall shed its pretences and stand out for what it is. It will do that when it finds itself without the power to hoodwink or cajole, when its Carnegies and Burnses can no longer be relied upon to deceive or delude—when, that is, the working class have understood their position and their power. And just as surely as capitalism finds itself in that condition and is obliged to decide that the time has come when it must organise its forces openly and avowedly against the army of the workers, will the workers be on the eve of their emancipation. There is no doubt of the issue of the contest. Nothing can prevent the defeat and extermination of capitalism; nothing can prevent the victory and development of Labour. We may hasten or retard the day of final struggle but we cannot affect the result, just as we cannot prevent the ultimate dawn of the day itself. But because we can hasten it by marching straight and speaking true and calling things by their right names we have come together to do it. Wherefore The Socialist Party of Great Britain.

ALEGRA.

FABIAN NOTES.

"The government of the future will be by experts and we, naturally, want to be the experts." (H. SNELL speaking for the Fabian Society.)

So now you know, if you did not before, what the Fabian Society are after. Their "Socialism" is government by bureau, and "naturally" (sweet word) they want to be the bureaucrats. "Naturally" they want the plums. "Naturally" they want to sit in the seats of authority and arrange things for the benefit (naturally for the benefit) of the other and somewhat lower orders who do the mere producing.

"Naturally" these producers will be unable of themselves to administer their own affairs. Because "naturally" such delicately intricate work as will "naturally" be involved in the manipulation of affairs of state, "naturally" demands a special type of mind, specially trained. And obviously, not to say "naturally" the working class *qua* working class, the working class that is to say *per se*, do not possess such necessary and entirely essential qualities. They must "naturally" look for their administrators, therefore, among the cultured class who, "naturally" endowed with imperial qualities have consecrated their lives to their development and with infinite pains have rendered themselves fit to enter into the holy of holies from which will issue those inspired directions and words of good counsel without which the labourers in the vineyards (and other places) will be as sheep without a shepherd, as little children stumbling in the dark.

The members of the Fabian Society having quite clearly all the special equipment necessary, therefore quite "naturally" desire that the working class shall acclaim them the saviours of Society and signify implicit confidence in their capacity by unhesitatingly conceding them the right to govern.

But I think, I say I think, it will not work out quite like that. I think, mark, I think, that there will be some little hesitancy before the working class admit the necessity for the creation of a bureaucratic staff, or a star chamber, or a holy of holies even to such fierce democrats as the Fabian Society. I think it not unlikely that the working class will look somewhat dubiously upon a method of government such as they have been somewhat painfully familiar with for several generations and may even conclude that, on the whole, they would prefer to try something else—a method, for example, by which they themselves would be the dictatorial authority expressing their requirements through administrators who would be mere delegates with their instructions in their pockets. The intellectual equipment of administrators in these circumstances need not necessarily be exceptional.

Of course the Fabian Society will unanimously agree that such a hypothesis is entirely grotesque. And as the Fabian Society are experts in the grotesque their view may quite properly be given the consideration it so well merits. But as this is my funeral, they need not distress themselves too severely even if I persist in pressing the probability of their super-excellent services being in small demand, and proceed to submit that their idea of government under Socialism is likely to be regarded as antiquated and fitting only to the conditions which obtained in the nightmare days of capitalism. However preposterous it may seem to them, I think it quite possible that as there will be no interests to administer except the interests of the working class, the present geographical unit of alleged representation, based as it is upon the private ownership of the means of life, will be superseded by representation of labour departments. The honourable member for East Leamshire will give way to Citizen Smith, the delegate of the Gasworkers and General Labourers' Federation or some such labour organisation. As, so far as I have been able to observe, the Fabian Society's idea of the government of the future rests upon the continuance of the present bureaucratic forms, such an alteration would tend to have the effect of knocking the Fabian Society's heaven-sent powers somewhat acock.

Let me submit with becoming humility that the Labour organisations of the future being composed of moderately intelligent men (such intelligence being necessarily antecedent to the Socialist State) might understand almost, if not quite, as well as a Fabian expert—I am charitably assuming that the Fabian expert is not knocked acock as aforesaid—what they required for their own comfort and happiness and might (its most outrageous proposition) even be in a better position than the inspired governmental Shavian to decide upon such changes in the machinery and methods of industry in their own department as would facilitate production and ensure them greater leisure and less arduous labour. And their conferences would instruct their delegate accordingly.

It's an interesting subject and my vagrant speculations could, I am sure, be extended to cover several more columns at least. But the exigencies of space and pressure of many matters force me to an immediate closure. I will only add that in all my anticipations of the probable outworkings of the Socialist Society of tomorrow I can, without allowing my imagination to riot, easily conceive that there will be no overpowering necessity for any legislative holy of holies or for any administrative caste, or for any bureau of inspired experts. And however natural the longing of the "culchavel" Fabian may be for the seat of authority and the halo of beneficent superiority, it may well chafe that he will not be appreciated at anything like his own estimated worth, and it may even happen in that event, that he will find himself in the unhappy position of being obliged to devote himself to the acquisition of some information likely to make of him a useful member of Society. I would therefore respectfully advise him to start trying to pick up the rudiments of a helpful calling—say woodchopping—lest the revolution overtake him while he is still endeavouring to articulate his vain regrets. His very vain regrets.

A. JAMES.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, subscriptions for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, articles, correspondence and advertisements submitted for insertion therein should be addressed.—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 28, Cursitor St., London, E.C., to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD is published on the first Saturday in each month.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office every Tuesday at 7 p.m. The Office is open every Saturday until 4 p.m.

Terms of Subscriptions.

UNITED KINGDOM.		
Twelve Months	...	1s. 6d.
Six Months	...	9d.
AMERICA.		
Twelve Months	...	50 cents.
Six Months	...	25 cents.

Scale of Charges for Advertisements.

	£	s.	d.
Per Inch, One Insertion	...	0	2 0
Quarter Column do.	...	0	5 6
Half Column do.	...	0	10 0
One Column do.	...	1	0 0

Special arrangements will be made for Advertisements to be inserted in more than one issue.

The Socialist Standard.



SATURDAY, FEB. 2, 1907.

London County Council, Ltd.

The Independent Labour Party, who have long supported the Liberals and Progressives on the L.C.C., have issued a manifesto on the coming elections, and have in consequence been repudiated by their friends. It is rather unkind, after the way in which the I.L.P. have worked for and supported the L.C.C. capitalist majority, for the latter, in fear of the prospective Progressive rout, to turn upon and rend their faithful allies. But so it is. The Progressive organ, *The Daily Chronicle*, in a leading article on the "I.L.P. Boogey," insists in regard to their manifesto that "the document in question is issued by the I.L.P. on its own account. The Progressive Party have nothing to do with it whatever." The Progressive organ dismisses the I.L.P. municipal milk proposal as "unnecessary, impracticable and undesirable." It also says: "One of the Progressive leaders, Sir Edwin Cornwall, happens to be a large coal merchant, and he has very naturally been asked what he thinks of the proposal to municipalise the coal supply of London. He thinks it sheer nonsense, and so, we imagine, will all Progressives." Moreover it adds that "the County Council has, for the most part, no power to do the things which the manifesto talks about. A whole series of Acts of Parliament would be required to make them possible, and there is no likelihood that the series will be forthcoming." All of which, to say the least, is base ingratitude toward the I.L.P. For what do the proposals amount to? Merely the extension of milk and water municipalisation—the substitution of municipal capitalism for private capitalism in certain industries—that is all. Until the working class controls, nationally and locally, the municipal services that are undertaken will only be used for the benefit of the master class, and the L.C.C. policy has been no exception to this rule. The interest of the workers has ever been sacrificed to the interest of the propertied class. Indeed, the L.C.C., far from being a model employer, is noticeably inferior to a vast number of private firms in the treatment of its workmen. The hypocrisy of the Liberal Progressives is as plain as is the futility of the policy of the Independent Labour Party, which mistakes municipal and state capitalism for Socialism.

The Quintessence of Socialism.

There are quite a number of people in this country who call themselves Socialists because they believe in the municipalisation or nationalisation

of various things. And these good people appear to be oblivious of the fact that the very essence of Socialism is the control of wealth production and distribution by the wealth producers. It is obvious that if a number of thieves are banded together they are not likely to seek less booty, or seek it less effectively, than when isolated; so, therefore, the capitalist class, who control the national and local administrative bodies, are not likely to seek less profit, or to seek it less effectively, when their businesses come under their collective control than when they control them individually. The end and aim of a capitalist is profit, whether it comes as interest on Metropolitan Water Board bonds or as dividend on shares in the A.B.C.; and the ruling class will not, indeed, undertake municipal or national services at all unless their interests are thereby served and their general profits increased. An industry taken over by the capitalist State, though it may be also of advantage in other respects, means that more wealth is thereby to be wrung from the workers. The sweating in government factories, the low wages in the Post Office that enable over £4,000,000 to go in relief of capitalist taxation, are an earnest of what State capitalism means. Nationalised industries can only become Socialistic, and can only be of real benefit to the workers, when the working class has obtained control of the administrative machinery. It is therefore of the utmost importance that the political movement of the workers place itself firmly on the basis of the class struggle. Indeed, all who do not recognise this fact, whatever they may call themselves, are emphatically not Socialists, for mere nationalisation, we repeat, is not Socialism at all.

A Nation of Serfs.

Another aspect of the matter that is not often taken note of is the restriction of political liberty which often goes with the nationalisation of a branch of industry. Lord Selborne's circular (which has been endorsed by Lord Elgin) is a case in point—the railway servants in the Transvaal being forbidden to take active part in the elections there. Railway men in this country who have clamoured for nationalisation, have profound misgivings when they see the Liberal Government cripple the political activity of government railway workers. Mr. Winston Churchill has been approached by them on the matter, but he is inexorable and has said: "It has long been held to be undesirable that regular government servants should conspicuously take sides in party politics, and in consequence the railway servants in both the neighbouring self-governing colonies of Natal and the Cape are expressly forbidden to do so." Prominent members of the present government have in the past expressed themselves strongly against the exercise of the vote by municipal employees and civil servants. This is, indeed, no new policy. The postal servants have long been expressly forbidden to take active part in politics. Supporters of the existing regime can, indeed, be brutally frank on this matter when it suits them. In a letter to the *Daily Chronicle* recently, Mr. Arnold White said in praise of the Government, that it had shown that efficiency was not incompatible with economy by its naval policy in abandoning obsolete dockyards, etc., and in "discharging redundant workmen who use their votes to get higher pay."

The italics are ours. Though government servants are not, as yet, deprived of the vote, its value is seriously lessened by the restriction of political action. The significance of this matter may be judged from a consideration of its probable effect on the political movement of the working class if all were government servants and forbidden to take sides in political affairs. The political organisation of the workers would be rendered practically impossible, their emancipation would be retarded, and the movement driven underground. The mere nationalisation of an industry gives the ruling class greater power over the workers, and, to take the railways as an example, instead of nationalisation bringing the workers a step near to the control of industry, it is likely to find them with their political wings clipped, and even more at the mercy of capitalism than before. Instead of helping to strengthen the chains which bind them, the workers should at last realise the futility of anything short of working-class supremacy.

FOR CHRIST'S SAKE.

The following is a bare statement of the experiences of a man who, out of work and with a wife and four children to support, applied, with a letter from a local clergyman, to one of the Church Army Depots, for work. The man lives at No. 8a, Hornsey-st., Holloway-rd., at 8 a.m. on December 4th. With five others he was told to apply at 9 a.m. and was then given a cross-cut saw and started by a Church Army Officer at cutting a heap of old, damp wood full of nails. The men worked in pairs; the wood was of all shapes and sizes but had to be cut into pieces 5½ inches in length. After working from 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. without food (although a dinner time was allowed between 1 and 2) our correspondent and his mate had cut 274 lbs. between them. For this he received 10½d. less than 1½d. per hour! It is not suggested that his mate worked harder or better or had more to shew for his efforts, but his mate received 2 6. Another pair who cut between them in the same time 180 lbs received 2 6 and 6d. respectively. The third pair, who had cut about 175 lbs received 6d. and 5½d.

Thinking himself rather hardly used in the circumstances our correspondent addressed the chief secretary of the Church Army and received a reply from W. W. Jenmett, who said: "We regret to hear that you are dissatisfied, but it should not be necessary for us to explain to every man why some other applicant should be placed on special work under special conditions." He concludes: "The half-crown a day rate of pay is not the usual scale."

On the face of it there is here shewn a discrimination which resembles the peace of the God the Church Army are alleged to serve, in that it passeth all understanding. In very special circumstances a man may get 2 6 a day for one day, which is remuneration at the rate of 3½d. per hour. This, to put it mildly, is not munificent. Even in the rare contingency of the recipient receiving it as a regular rate of pay for six days a week, there is not a great chance of exercising thrift, of putting by for a rainy day, after the wants of a wife and four children are attended to—not to mention the unimportant wants of the rent collector. Divide the total by four, however, and it becomes at once apparent that the Church Army holds to the belief that the day when the hunger-cravings of thousands could be satisfied with two small loaves and five small fishes is by no means past. Ten pence, ten whole pence, a day—a clear rise of nine pence upon the wage of the biblical labourers who engaged themselves to work in the vineyards. What possibilities of saving are here. Why not accept the letter of holy writ in this connection and reduce the scale of remuneration to the vineyard labourers' figure? It would then be possible to employ ten men where to-day only one can be employed. The "right to work" would have been conceded. The unemployed problem would be solved!

But what if we dispense with the hypothesis of miraculous properties in Church Army pennies? What if the purchasing power of Church Army money is no more than the filthy lucre of common usage? In that case we can only say that if there is an organisation existing anywhere which has succeeded in "grinding the faces of the poor" to better purpose we have yet to hear of it, and we say this fairly cognisant of the workings of that other religious Army which has so successfully combined the business of the salvation of souls with the damnation of bodies.

We may return to the matter again, but meantime, perhaps the Church Army would like a word.

IMPORTANT NOTICE.

Next month's issue will contain an article on the Labour Party Conference at Belfast; an interesting letter on "Why Every Other Political Party is Hostile to the S.P.G.B." and a reply by "Economicus"; a report of a Debate held last month at Plumstead between E. J. B. Allen (S.L.P.) and our Comrade J. Fitzgerald, etc.

Help the Cause of Socialism by subscribing to THE SOCIALIST STANDARD. See terms on p. 44.

A LOOK ROUND.

The Street Betting Act was a great victory for Reform, according to the *Daily News*, which suppresses starting prices but not Stock Exchange quotations.

The first result has been to intensify the unemployed problem. Men who had been living by "making a book," acting as touts, etc., have taken to legitimate business, and workmen have been discharged to make room for them. *Reynold's Newspaper* says that prominent police officials openly express the opinion that rigid administration of the Act will have a distinct tendency to increase breaches of the law in other directions as an enormous number of persons have been suddenly compelled to find some new means of livelihood.

What are they going to do? The *Daily News* knows that it is impossible for every one to get permanent employment to-day, that a large section of the community must prey upon the others. And if by Acts of Parliament or acts of God certain of them are suddenly deprived of their usual means of livelihood, they must seek a living elsewhere.

Perhaps the *Daily News* will permit "L.G. C.M." to explain how these bookmakers, touts, runners, watchers, and all others connected with street betting can get an honest living in view of the indisputable fact that so many already find it impossible to do so.

If all drunkards became teetotallers, all pick-pockets and burglars reformed, all corner-boys turned over a new leaf, all tramps became enthusiastic for "honest" toil, what a happy land England would be! Would it, my Christian friends? Think what it would mean if all these folk entered the labour market and competed for "honest work," a labour market already so overstocked that many of the largest and strongest Trade Unions find their resources taxed to the uttermost, owing to the heavy and increasing demands upon their Unemployment Funds.

The Rev. C. F. Aked, who has been "called" from the Pembroke Baptist Chapel, Liverpool, to J. D. Rockefeller's Fifth Avenue Church, New York, says that he has received hundreds of begging letters and wonders whether people take him for a fool. If it be true that he is giving up £1,500 for £5,000 a year, his wonderment seems somewhat unnecessary.

Rockefeller did not take him for a fool, but for a tool. The Trust Magnates can foresee the approaching struggle between the "have-nots" and the millionaire holders of aggregated capital. They will endeavour to delay it by every possible means. In this they will be assisted by "advanced" clergymen, who will accept the slaveholders' dollars to preach patience and peace to the wage slaves.

The first number of the *Voice of Labour* says that "the Labour movement, organised, federated, largely international, holds in its hands, even more than it deems, the forces that shall fashion the future." That is why the politician, Socialist, Labour, and Liberal, promises so much to gain its votes. This is on page 1. On page 7 it says "When the people find that the Socialists and Anarchists are not what the Press depicts" &c.

We note that "the Editor is not necessarily in agreement with, nor does he hold himself responsible for, signed articles," and the article on page 7 is signed. According to it the Socialists are not what the Press (i.e., the *Voice of Labour*) depicts.

We freely admit that there are some calling themselves Socialists who have promised and do promise all sorts of impossible "reforms" to gain working-class votes. We have charged

them with misleading the working class and adding to working class confusion, and we have given evidence in proof of our charges. But we claim that these people have no right to call themselves Socialists, and we have always held that the workers will not be emancipated until they emancipate themselves. Surely our friends of the *Voice of Labour* know whether they are Socialists or Anarchists?

The Conservative Press are doing their utmost to convey the impression that Progressivism and Socialism are one. They are as wide asunder as the Poles. But there is certainly some justification for this in view of the municipal this and municipal that which members of the Labour Party, S.D.F., I.L.P., and Fabian Society devote their time to advocating. And now, according to *Justice*, we have Councillor J. Jones (S.D.F.), opposing Mr. B. Sansome in a debate on "That the Progressive and Socialist Policy on Municipal affairs is harmful to the Community and especially to the Working Class."

Councillor John Jones opposes the proposition that the Progressive Municipal Policy is harmful to the working class. Why then, does the S.D.F. declare itself in opposition to Progressives, and appeal for funds to enable it to put forward candidates when its candidatures may result in Progressive seats going to the Municipal Reformers and an alternative policy to that of the Progressives and Socialists being pursued?

Mr. Will Thorne, M.P., has been interviewed for the *Trades and Labour Gazette*. "I cannot tell you," he says, "when I became a Socialist." Neither can we. "In trade unionism I am known as a Socialist"; he adds, "my municipal work has been done with Socialist ideals before me; and when I entered the House of Commons it was as a Labour man and a Socialist." (note which is first). "My constituents sent me there as such. My fellow members know me as a Socialist, at least I think they do. In a short time I hope so to manage things that there will be no doubt about it!"

And so, although he became attached to the S.D.F. in 1884, and is still a member, he has a doubt whether his fellow M.P.'s know him as a Socialist! But it will, he hopes, be all right in a short time, when he manages things differently.

Mr. Winston Churchill has written, "My dear Bell," meaning Richard of that ilk, Labour Leader and Liberal M.P. for Derby, defending the action of the Liberal Government in prohibiting the Servants of the Central South African Railways from taking an active part in political agitation. He thinks it right that "prominent political activities should be denied to them, so long as they continue, as Government Servants, to draw Government pay," and approves of the circular issued by Lord Elgin "has acted very properly."

What a howl of execration went up from Liberals when it was suggested that certain Tory employers here had endeavoured to deny "prominent political rights" to their employees. But now that the Liberals are in office their dictum is that government employment must carry with it political disabilities. And Mr. Bell, as a good Liberal, will continue to support his Party, even tho' they prove their readiness, when opportunity offers, to do that which the ordinary capitalist does not attempt to do, viz., control their wage slaves out of working hours.

In the *Journeymen Bakers Magazine* appears a portrait and interview with Mr. Alexander Wilkie, M.P., General Secretary, Associated Shipwrights' Society. Asked what books had exercised the greatest influence on his life, he replied, "the Bible and the poetry of Robert Burns." "When all is said and done," he added, "I fall back upon the Bible and Burns, and I am of opinion that a man cannot build his life upon a more stable foundation."

At the December meeting of the London Trades Council a resolution was moved protesting against the sentence passed upon Stoker Moody, and Mr. Quelch moved to add the words "and demands the abolition of courts-martial in times of peace." He did this, he said, with a view to civilising the Services and breaking the rule of caste. From which it would appear that he believes in courts-martial but only in times of capitalist war, not when the capitalist class are pleased to be at peace with each other and are not ordering the working class to risk their lives in the interests of their masters. And does Mr. Quelch really think that the capitalists will abolish courts-martial because he may persuade the L.T.C. to pass a resolution "demanding" it?

Later, Mr. Quelch moved: "That this Council condemns the encouragement of 'jingoism' given by the surreptitious introduction of rifle practice into our elementary schools as part of the ordinary curriculum, and calls for the abolition of the standing army as being dangerous, unnecessary, and unconstitutional; this Council being further of opinion that all the military requirements of the nation would be met by the adequate training of all citizens in early manhood to the use of arms, thus constituting the whole manhood of the nation a citizen force for the national defence, and free from the burden and charges of the present military organisation."

The italics are ours. What is the nation, and what is national defence? The nation to-day is the propertied class, in whose interests wars are carried on. Preparing for the national defence means preparing to defend the property and interests of the propertied class of Great Britain against the interests of the propertied class of another country. Should Socialists encourage the working class to believe that they have national interests that must be defended?

Mr. Quelch claimed that he was the first to use the phrase in this country the "armed nation." He said that Mr. Haldane hoped to get his "armed nation" on the voluntary system. But the voluntary system had broken down. He was opposed to teaching children the use of firearms, in the way in which it was being introduced, because he believed it was intended to encourage a love of militarism and to bolster up the voluntary system. What they wanted was universal training every man drilled and armed as a soldier, but remaining a citizen, as in Switzerland. . . . This was not conscription . . . it was the antidote to conscription, to militarism, and to jingoism, and so on.

From which a very clear idea of Mr. Quelch's position can be obtained. He would civilise the Services, i.e., offer greater inducements to the working class to become "food for powder" in the interests of the capitalist class and their property; he objects to the surreptitious introduction of rifle practice into elementary schools—he would do it openly and above board, then it would not encourage jingoism; he is opposed to voluntary effort, and would make it compulsory for every citizen to be drilled and trained in the use of arms; this compulsion is not conscription, certainly not, "only ignorant or untruthful persons so describe it"; he would foster the idea of nationalism, and would have the working class compelled, by their masters, to make adequate preparation to defend the national (capitalists') interests against those of some other national capitalists.

I could understand Mr. Quelch advocating that as a workman becomes class-conscious he should take steps to prepare for the defence of the international working class against the international capitalist class, that he should not pin his faith to one method of attacking and ultimately vanquishing his exploiters, but it is beyond my comprehension how a professing Socialist can advocate a narrow and working-class dividing nationalism. In opposition to his attitude we say: "Workers of all countries unite: you have nothing to lose but your chains; you have the world to gain."

J. RAY.

THE LATE DISPUTE IN ISLINGTON.

STATEMENT BY E.C.

R.B. (Goodmayes).—The matter stands thus—A number of members of the Islington Branch were found guilty, by a party vote, of action detrimental to the interests of the organisation and injurious to the cause of Socialism, and they were expelled therefore. They now refuse, we understand, to accept the Party's decision, and still pose as members of the Islington Branch. This is ludicrous enough, but when at the same time that they are asserting their membership, they proclaim to the world that the Party is rotten and corrupt, the matter becomes sheer farce. We regret exceedingly that our late comrades should place themselves in so deplorably ridiculous a position, but that is their business, not ours. Our business is to warn everybody concerned against the false pretence they make of membership of the S.P.G.B.

The above paragraph which, in answer to a correspondent, appeared in THE SOCIALIST STANDARD of December, 1906, caused several other enquiries to reach this office, and in reply to them we publish the following statement in accordance with the notice which appeared in the January issue. The facts of the case are as follows: A certain branch—the members of which have since been expelled and the branch dissolved—submitted a certain resolution to an annual conference of the Party. The resolution after being discussed was defeated. A vote of the Party was afterwards taken as to whether the conference was in order in discussing the matter at all. The Party vote ruled the conference out of order, and this decision was submitted to and accepted by every branch of the Party. The Islington Branch was not content to leave the matter thus; it first of all requested a formal withdrawal of the resolution in question. The E.C. answered that as the branch concerned had accepted the finding of the Party vote it was unnecessary to proceed any further in the matter. The Islington Branch was not satisfied with this, however, but instead of requesting the E.C. to take a vote of the Party as to whether the branch in question should be asked to rescind the resolution complained of, or endeavouring to obtain the support of five other branches to compel the E.C. to do so—both of which alternatives were open to it within the constitution of the Party—the Islington Branch, because the E.C. would not insist on "the removal of the said resolution from the books of the branch concerned" (which would have involved the falsification of the branch's records), accused the E.C. of criminal neglect, and forthwith stopped all propaganda work, thus violating the Party's rules, which reserve to the E.C. the supervision of the work of the Party. It then proceeded to endeavour to depose the E.C., but signally failed to get the necessary support from the Party membership.

The E.C. meantime could do nothing but place the matter before the Party. Our rules do not allow our E.C. to expel any member or any branch, but provide for the Party members settling all disputes themselves. The E.C., therefore, under the only rule of the Party's constitution governing disputes between E.C. and branches, (Rule XIX) placed the matter in the hands of the Party. In accordance with this Rule the case came on for hearing at the next Delegate Meeting of the Party. Islington was officially represented by its own delegate, and six of its members were present. No delegate of any branch had instructions to vote Islington's expulsion, but when the case for the E.C. was heard and Islington's delegate would not even try to defend the branch's actions, and when the six members who were present were asked to speak either for their branch or on their own behalf, and further when one of them (Mr. Lehanne) was told that he was the prime mover in, and cause of, all the trouble, and was challenged to deny it and defend himself and his branch, and when he and the others were unable to say a single word in defence either of themselves or their branch, or in support of the charges they had made against the E.C., the delegates present took their silence as evidence of their having no defence, and as an insult to the whole Party.

Acting under rule XXII, the only rule in the Party's constitution governing Delegate Meetings, the delegates proposed a resolution calling for a vote of the Party as to whether the members of the Islington Branch supporting its

attitude should be expelled the Party. Every delegate present voted for this except the Islington delegate. The resolution was submitted to the Party vote and an overwhelming majority voted for expulsion.

The E.C., therefore, had to declare them expelled the Party.

Even this did not satisfy them, and, refusing to accept the majority vote of the Party, they proceeded to "expose" the Party to the general public, and, while declaring the Party to be rotten and corrupt, etc., still claimed and boasted of membership in it.

Two pamphlets, compiled by Mr. Lehanne, have been issued to expose the "rotteness" of the Socialist Party of Great Britain. These pamphlets carry their own refutation, and as we have no intention of lowering the tone of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD to a tone Mr. Lehanne was justly proud of when he was in the Party—to the level of the "Political Comic Cuts" or the "Penny Prevaricator," nor any desire to insult the intelligence of our readers, we respectfully decline to treat seriously the garbage served up in those productions. This much only need we add: Mr. Lehanne was for a considerable time our general secretary. In office he proved a good servant to a party which, however, could not and cannot tolerate a master, good, bad or indifferent. Being, however, in that position, Mr. Lehanne knew the Party thoroughly from its very centre, and therefore we can only accept the weakness of his "exposure" as a glowing testimony to our strength. The whole dispute was as unfortunate as it was unnecessary, and we have no wish to prolong the agony or embitter personal feelings in the matter. It has, however, proved that the membership of the S.P.G.B., much though it may appreciate and love its public champions, loves the Principles of Socialism more, and that hero worship, or on the other hand, personalities, can have no place in its propaganda.

Knowing this, we are confident that many of those with whom we have had so recently to differ will soon be with us again, fighting in the ranks where all are fighters but none are leaders.

CORRESPONDENCE.

[To the Editor of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD.]

IS SOCIETY AN ORGANISM?

THE question of the organic nature of Society is only of interest to us, as Socialists, in so far as it throws light on Socialist policy; and it is to be regretted that Mr. Wright has not, in his letter in the January number, discussed the subject from this point of view. Indeed, he ignores the bulk of the evidence brought forward on this matter, and confines himself to some word-twisting on one or two relatively unimportant points; the discussion, therefore, becomes to a large extent unprofitable. I cannot, however, refrain from joining issue with him on the few points he does raise.

Let me, in the first place, assure Mr. Wright that I had no intention of questioning his good faith when I alluded to him as being professing revolutionary. I intended to convey that, in my opinion, his ideas on the nature of Society are not consistent with his revolutionary views. This opinion I still hold, while disclaiming any unkind intentions which my words may have appeared to show.

In his main argument Mr. Wright has shifted ground. He said in his first letter: "Reminding you that human society must be as complex and contain the same organic parts as its individual members, I will ask, to where in Society can you point and say: 'There are the brains of Society, there are the lungs of Society, there is the heart of Society, and so on.'" Clearly the argument here is not that Society may differ from, or be more complex than, its organic unit, but that it must be, as a whole, alike in structure and alike in functions; an identity that he makes to extend even to motherhood and childbirth! The fallacy of this was shown by taking Mr. Wright's own analogy of the human body, where the organic unit—the cell—is not the same either in structure or function as the human body as a whole, for new combinations produce new conditions and results. Just as the organisation and differentiation of innumerable cells produce, in the human being, an entity vastly

different from the individual cell, so the necessary and involuntary organisation of men in Society produces a social organism very different from the individual human being. Mr. Wright, however, now endeavours to make it appear that his argument was, that Society, to be an organism, should be at least as complex as its organic unit. But he surely wastes his time in arguing that the human body, since it contains cells, is at least as complex as those cells; for precisely the same is true of Society which is composed of human beings. It is, indeed, mere tautology, and no argument against the organic nature of Society at all. I must, indeed, decline to credit Mr. Wright with having originally intended anything so childish. The whole trend of his first argument was that Society, to be an organism, must be a huge human being, with brains, heart and lungs, going through childbirth and motherhood, the absurdity of which is seen in that by the same reasoning the human body to be an organism should be only one huge cell, and propagate by fission.

My statement that "though the highest types of human society may be indefinite as compared with the human body, yet they are much more definite than many low forms of organic life," is quite correct, for though even according to Mr. Wright's reasoning Society cannot be less complex than individual human beings since it contains them, nevertheless Society as a whole does not reproduce the same definiteness and rigidity of outline as does the human body.

In like manner many of the Protozoa (Cenobia) consist of mere aggregations of cells with scarcely a trace of specialisation, and the individual Protozoa, as an entity, is much less constant and definite in form and size than are the regular and definite cells of which it is composed.

The tenour of Mr. Wright's argument may be further seen in the following from his second letter. He says: "If a man is subject to certain conditions, surely it follows that his individual cells are subject to the same conditions. Society, therefore, can have no conditions apart from its component cells." Since Society, like any other organism, is but the combination of its component cells, it follows that Mr. Wright is gravely informing us that "Society can have no conditions apart from Society," which is very thoughtful of him. Had this been all intended to convey he doubtless would not have written, but the matter is so worded as to give colour to the absurdity that underlies his whole argument, and which has already been dealt with: to wit, that Society must, as a whole, be the same in the distribution of its parts and in its functions, as the individual unit or cell.

Mr. Wright disagrees with my illustration of the hive bees because the drones do not own and control the means of production and distribution. My analogy, however, was sound, and clearly illustrated my point; though, it is true, the bees do not possess the vote! The drones, like our capitalist class, live upon others' labour, and at one period of their existence both were necessary to the advance of their respective social organisms; and the drones, like our present capitalist class, outlive their usefulness and must be driven out.

To admit that the hive of bees or colony of ants are social organisms, and at the same time deny the organic nature of human Society would be inconsistent, and Mr. Wright, though careful to say that he does not positively deny that Society is an organism, would, apparently, embrace any absurdity rather than admit that it is; so the fact that the hive of bees is a social organism is consequently not recognised.

The denial of the organic nature of Society usually arises from Utopianism and an unscientific view of sociology; it arises from a conception that men are entirely free agents, and that Society as a whole is a voluntary social contract. A very important part of our work consists in pointing out that Society is not a piece of architecture thrown up according to preconceived human plans, but an organism that develops and grows according to discoverable laws; and that human ideas are in their origin the result or reflex of social life and growth; while the intellectual movements of mankind are in reality secondary to, and evidences of adaptation to, great and irresistible economic changes.

F. C. WATTS.

THOSE ALIENS!

WILL. (to George, who is discovered reading the *Daily District*): Hello! looking for a loser?

GEORGE: No, I'm reading about those confounded aliens. Those foreign bakers are allowed to come over here and they immediately start agitations and strikes as though the country belonged to them. Taking the bread out of our mouths, I call it.

WILL: Why, you're a funny chap. You grumble if they work cheaply, and you grumble if they try to better their lot. I suppose the fact is you hate them, and they could do nothing to please you.

GEORGE: Who can help hating the beggars when they take our jobs away from us. Why don't they go back to their own country?

WILL: Look here, George, the foreign workman has no more a country of his own than you have: his native land, like yours, is the property of a master class and the worker has not even burial space of his own.

GEORGE: That's an odd tale.

WILL: But can you deny its truth?

(George does not answer.)

WILL: Do you know that the number of English who are abroad is much greater than the number of foreigners in England; so would you not be much worse off if all the English came back to compete with you in place of the foreigner? Your policy for every man to be compelled to remain in his native land is suicidal on that score alone.

(George scratches his head.)

WILL: And are you aware that in history the unmixed races, those peoples who are cut off from the world as you would have us be, remain primitive or become degenerate; while the mixed races, those roaming wide areas, are vigorous and progressive?

GEORGE: But why is it, then, that there are so many unemployed and pauperised in England if the alien is not the cause?

WILL: My dear fellow, they've got unemployed and paupers in every capitalist country; and they exist, not because of aliens, but because of capitalism.

GEORGE: I don't see that.

WILL: But you ought to. Let me make it plain. In the first place each western nation is divided broadly into two great groups or classes. One group owns the land, railways, mines, factories, machinery and buildings—in fact this class own all the means for producing wealth. The other group or class, on the contrary, do not own property, all they possess is their power to work which they must sell to the owners of the means of production, or else starve. The propertyless, ruling section we call the capitalist class; the propertyless, enslaved section we call the working class. Is that clear?

GEORGE: Oh, yes. I know which is my lot!

WILL: Good! Now this capitalist class want to get as much labour as they can out of the workers with as little expenditure of wages as possible. Hence a conflict of interests. Hence the capitalist class will employ Chinamen or even gorillas if they are cheaper and can work as well as their own countrymen. Hence the propertyless class are ever seeking and introducing new inventions, machines and methods by means of which more can be produced with less spent in wages. You can now see, George, that the master class, being able to supply the markets and get their profits with the aid of proportionally fewer employees, cut down their wages bill and create the unemployed. Hardly a day passes without some new invention or process displacing some of the wage-earners. It is not the alien that causes the unemployed, but it is the ownership of the means of production by a class who use every improvement in them against the workers. The more wealth can be produced to-day, the fewer workers do the ruling class need to employ. The wealthier the country under capitalism the poorer and more miserable are the workers in proportion. Capitalism, by making the workers disinherited and outcast in Society, is the cause of unemployment and pauperism, whilst the despised alien is in reality simply a fellow sufferer and a brother.

GEORGE: But how would your Socialism alter that?

WILL: Socialism would alter it by making

the working class the whole nation; by using the working class capture of the political power to turn all the means of production into the collective, democratically controlled, property of the people. Improvements in production, new inventions, or an increase in the number of workers, would then, instead of, as now, throwing numbers of the working class out of work to starve, increase the wealth and decrease the toil of all. The workers will have come into their own and be no longer outcasts in the world their labour has created.

GEORGE: I see. A co-operative commonwealth. That certainly is worth working for.

WILL: It is, indeed, the only thing worth striving for, and I hope you'll join us; always remembering, though, that the foreign worker is really our brother, for our interests are the same, and our enemy is the same. We have not to fight one another, but to aid each other in conquering the common enemy, the capitalist class of all countries. With the ruling class patriotism is the mask of self interest; with the working class it is the brand of utter ignorance. Let us be international.

F.C.W.

LITERARY CURIOSITIES.

No. 4. DAN IRVING'S ELECTION ADDRESS.

It should be recorded that this document was sent out with Irving's compliments as a directly personal communication and appeal.

MUNICIPAL ELECTION—GANNOW WARD.
Thursday, Nov. 1st, 1906.

TO THE BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL ELECTIONERS IN THE WARD.

Committee Room, 47, Hargher Street,
Burnley, Oct. 29th, 1906.

Dear Sir or Madam,

For obvious reasons business and professional people do not care to disclose their intentions as to voting at elections. We, therefore, do not propose that our canvassers shall call upon you in the ordinary manner to solicit your vote on behalf of our Candidate.

We do, however, ask for your favourable consideration of our Candidate's address, believing you will find that the proposals contained therein are such as would be beneficial to the whole community. The public record of our Candidate, Mr. Dan Irving, is one, we contend, of good service done in the public interest, and such as has indeed won admiration and respect from many of his political opponents, and proves his capacity and fitness to serve the Ward as its representative on the Town Council.

Our efforts to bring about better conditions for the wage-earning classes are not at all inconsistent with the best interests of the class to which you belong. Higher wages, better education and increased leisure tends to a higher standard of living, increases the needs, and supplies the means whereby the working-classes purchase more from the Tradespeople and utilize to an ever-increasing degree the services of the Professional Classes.

It is to our interest that the working-classes should be well-to-do. As ratepayers, too, our interests coincide with your own. In our judgment, any expenditure tending to promote the health and general well-being of the community, is expenditure from which all alike reap benefit. Extravagant and unnecessary expenditure is not to our advantage any more than to your own, and our representatives have always shown by their votes that they are opposed to the expenditure of public money for which we get an inadequate return in public good.

We know that, in the main, your class have hitherto opposed the aspirations of the organised Labour movement. We are of opinion that this is largely owing either to misconceptions, or that you have not really thought out what the effect of our proposals would be. A careful and kindly consideration of these would, we are convinced, bring you to see that your own best in-

terests are bound up in the general well-being of all.

We, therefore, ask for your vote and influence on behalf of our Candidate, Mr. Dan Irving, on Thursday, November 1st, and trust our appeal to your human rather than your class interests will not be in vain.

Yours truly,

THE L.R.C. COMMITTEE FOR GANNOW WARD.

RANDOM NOTES.

The "Right to Live Council" which, I am authoritatively informed, has no connection with the "Right to Work" Council, nor with any other of the countless myriads of organisations all existing to affirm the right of somebody to do something (or someone) has issued a Declaration of Principles of an exceedingly noteworthy character. I do not know the author but if I had the pleasure of his acquaintance I should certainly felicitate him upon the very scholarly way he has followed paragraph by paragraph, line by line and word for word, the Declaration of Principles which The Socialist Party of Great Britain drew up at its inception and which appears in every issue of this journal.

o o o

I do not accept the suggestion of unblushing plagiarism which accompanied the manifesto when it reached me, preferring to regard it as a remarkable manifestation of the working of imitative subconsciousness which, as is well known, frequently erupts in a manner calculated to induce the belief (in the uncultured only) that the medium had (if it is a literary "case") lifted his matter "entire." That this was not so in the instance of the "Right to Live Council" will be at once apparent to the discerning from the fact that here and there, subconscious coherency seems to desert the medium, and, lunged back upon his own resources, he is forced to fill in the breaks with transparently original matter. It is unfortunate perhaps that the original matter makes hash (colloquially, I believe, "Pork" or "Tripe") of the whole document, but as we are not considering it as a contribution to the intellectual wealth of nations, but rather as a curious psychological study, that point need not be greatly laboured. "The Right to Live Council" (at one shilling per councillor) has arrived, and if it only plays the triangle in the "Labour" Band it is, I suppose, doing as well as the pianist who constituted the orchestra of a certain mining camp theatre and who was protected by a large placarded appeal to the chivalry of the audience in these terms: "Please do not shoot the pianist. He is doing his best!"

o o o

"The object of Socialism was to harmonise these conflicting interests of Capital and Labour." Of course, if there is no class war these interests can be harmonised—easily. But as there is a class war, as witness the "conflicting interests" of Capital and Labour, the "silver-tongued orator" of the L.L.P. is talking nonsense. If L.L.P. speakers paid less attention to the things they speak with and more attention to the things they speak, there would not be so much occasion to deride the stupidity of their utterances as at present there is. I must add that the orator in this case was Philip Snowden, M.P., speaking at the Earlsmead Council's School as reported in the *Tottenham Wednesday Herald* for November 28th, 1906.

o o o

"Municipal Socialism." The Bushey Urban District Council has unanimously decided to increase the wages of their scavengers from 11/- to 14/- per week. This rise from comparative comfort to absolute luxury may well be regarded by all real friends of progress with profound misapprehension. It is notorious that a sudden access of wealth invariably has demoralising effects which find expression too often in riotous debauchery and this fact coupled with the knowledge that it is the ratepayers' money which the Bushey Council are pouring out with such a lavish hand, will, we fear, place a weapon at the disposal of the enemies of municipalism which

they may use to the disadvantage of the revolutionary spirits on this revolutionary public authority. The Bushey Council should proceed with greater circumspection so that they may escape the charge of extravagance and the opprobrium that attaches to action possibly product of licentiousness and thriftlessness in the scavengers as well as dissatisfaction and unrest among those whose lot has not been cast in such easy places.

Clarion modesty. A correspondent is advised by the *Clarion* (11.1.07.) to study Shakespeare, Milton, *Blatchford*, and the Bible. Congratulations to Shakespeare, Milton and the authors of the Bible upon the latest addition to the ranks of the immortals.

The receipt of a copy of this paper is an invitation to subscribe.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

G.A.A.—Letter with enclosures duly to hand and contents noted. Sorry we cannot hope to find room for publication.

"BAKER" (Bromley)—Thanks. We are always glad to receive trade union statistics and other T.U. information.

T. GIBSON, (Chelmsford)—Your suggestion to hand and receiving consideration.

IMPORTANT.

A SOCIAL GATHERING OF PARTY MEMBERS AND FRIENDS

WILL BE HOLDEN

On GOOD FRIDAY

IN THE HALL OF

The Communist Club, CHARLOTTE STREET, W.

GREAT PROGRAMME IN PREPARATION.

SONGS, DANCES, etc.

DOORS OPEN . . . 7.30 p.m.

VOL. II

OF

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

(Sept., 1905 to Aug. 1906.)

Well bound in cloth, gold lettered,

Post Free . . . 3s. 0d.

Orders, accompanied by remittance, should be addressed: S.P.G.B., 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

Branch Secretaries and others

SHOULD NOTE THAT

JACOMB BROS.

Can do their printing as Cheaply and as well as anyone else.

JACOMB BROS., Printers,
STRATFORD, E.

Printed by Jacomb Bros., T.U., 2a Wingfield Road, Stratford E., for the Proprietors, The Socialist Party of Great Britain, and published at 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

HOLDS

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master-class, and the consequent enslavement of the working-class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working-class from the domination of the master-class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working-class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist-class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working-class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working-class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master-class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

NOW READY.

S.P.G.B. LIBRARY, No. 2.

From Handicraft to Capitalism,

Translated from the German of
KARL KAUTSKY.

The only translation in the English language of this important section of the famous "Das Erfurter Program."

POST FREE . . . 1½d.

S.P.G.B., 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

The Head Office of The Socialist Party of Great Britain is at 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

HEAD OFFICE:

28, CURSITOR STREET, LONDON, E.C.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—A. Jones, Secretary, 3, Mathew St., Latchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at S.P.G.B., Laburnum House, 134, High Street, Battersea, S.W. Club open every evening.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Executive Committee. Applications should be sent to the General Secretary.

EAST HAM.—W. Gifford, Sec., 31, Maryland Square, Stratford. Branch meets Mondays at 7.30 a 447, Katherine Rd., Forest Gate.

EDMONTON.—Sidney Auty, Sec., 60, Gilpin Grove, Edmonton. Branch meets Wednesdays 8.30.

FULHAM.—J. Humphries, Secretary, 309, North End Rd. Branch meets Feb. 15 and alternate Fridays at 8.30, at Ingram's Coffee Tavern, Fulham Cross.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Fri. at 8.30 at 79, Grove Rd., Holloway. Communications to the Sec.

PADDINGTON.—T. A. Wilson, Sec., 90, Mortimer Road, Kensal Rise, W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at Harley's Coffee Tavern (foot of Lock Bridge), Harrow Road.

PECKHAM.—W. Wren, Sec., 91, Evelina Rd., Nunhead, S.E. Branch meets every Wed. at 8.30.

ROMFORD DIVISION.—All communications to the Secretary, S.P.G.B. Club, 39, York Road, Ilford. Branch meets Mondays at 8 at Club.

TOOTING.—P. Dumenil, Secretary, 36, Byton Road, Tooting, S.W. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. at Gorrings Dining Rooms, Gorrings Park Parade, Tooting Junction.

TOTTENHAM.—T. Lobb, Sec. Branch meets Mon. 8 at p.m., at Sunbeam Coffee Tavern, High Rd.

WATFORD.—T. Wilkins, Sec., 4, Marlborough Rd. Branch meets alternate Fridays at 8 p.m.

WEST HAM.—G. C. H. Carter, Sec., 107, Ham Pk. Rd., Stratford. Branch meets Mondays 7.30, followed at 8.30 by discussion, at 447, Katherine Road, Forest Gate.

WOOD GREEN.—J. Crump, Secretary, 7, Dunloe Avenue, Downhill Park Road, Tottenham, N. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Sundays at 3.30.

WOOLWICH & PLUMSTEAD.—A. E. Rance, Sec., 71a, Marmadon Rd., Plumstead. Branch meets on 2nd and 4th Wednesdays in month at 80, Conway Road, Plumstead.

INFORMATION

concerning the Party can be obtained of the following
BIRMINGHAM.—H. Oldknow, 227, St. Saviour's Road, Saltley.

BRADFORD (Yorks).—Ben Wilde, 78, Godwin St.

BURTON-ON-TRENT.—J. Blundell, 157, New St.

LIVERPOOL.—J. M. O. Sullivan, 4, Laburnum Grove, Litherland.

MANCHESTER.—J. Marsh, 119, Blantyre Street, Swinton, Nr. Manchester.

BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, &c. to be obtained of the S.P.G.B., 28, Cursitor St., London, E.C.

CAPITAL (Karl Marx) . . . 5s. 6d.

SIX CENTURIES OF WORK AND WAGES (Thorold Rogers) . . . 5s. 6d.

POVERTY (Rowntree) . . . 4s. 6d.

SOCIALIST STANDARD

Vols. I. & II (Bound) each 3s. 0d.

MANIFESTO AND RULES of the S.P.G.B. . . . 1½d.

FROM HANDICRAFT TO CAPITALISM (Kautsky) 1½d.

COMMUNIST MANIFESTO . . . 2½d.

WAGE LABOUR & CAPITAL (Marx) 1½d.

JONES' BOY . . . 1½d.

SOCIALISM & THE WORKER (Sorge) 1½d.

HOW I BECAME A SOCIALIST (Morris) 1½d.

THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION (Kautsky) 7½d.

ALL POST FREE.

WHOLESALE AGENTS.

HENDERSON, 16, Paternoster Row, E.C.
JOHN HEYWOOD, Ltd., Deansgate, Manchester.
W. H. SMITH & SON, Blackfriars St., Manchester.

RETAIL AGENTS.

JACQUES, Old Street, E.C.
TUCKWELL, 160, Fonthill Road, Finsbury Park.
VESPERMAN, 251, Gray's Inn Road, W.C.
WREN, 91, Evelina Road, Nunhead, S.E.
ROOK, 2a, Cursitor Street, E.C.
GRANT, Ilford Hill, Ilford.
SIMPSON, 209, Leytonstone Road, Stratford, E.
BREWSTER, 153, Barking Rd., Canning Town.
WARNE, 1a, Queen's Square, Upton Park, E.
MENHINICK, 40, King William St., London B'dge.
FOX, 18a, New Kent Road, S.E.
BURKE, 35, Ford Street, Bow, E.

The
Official Organ
of
The
Socialist Party
of
Great Britain.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

No. 31. Vol. 3.]

LONDON, MARCH, 1907.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

THE SOCIALIST PARTY AND THE LABOUR PARTY.

A Wing of the Liberal Party.

We of The Socialist Party of Great Britain have cherished no fond delusions concerning the Labour Party. From our inception we have consistently opposed it, and the proceedings at its recent Conference confirm us in our antagonistic attitude.

In our Declaration of Principles, adopted on June 15, 1904, we declared "war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist," and in that reference the Labour Party (then the L.R.C.) was included. In the first issue of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD (Sept. 1904) we described the L.R.C. as the working-class wing of the Liberal Party,* with whom the I.L.P., who had neither the courage to proclaim themselves Socialists nor to disavow Socialism, were coquetting. After two and a half years not a word of our description need be withdrawn.

As might be expected, the President's address at Belfast was a model of moderation, well reflecting the conduct of the members in the House of Commons. Referring to the artist who, at the end of the General Election cartooned the leader as "Queer Hardie," he said: "We were a queer party, and a queer party we have proved ourselves to be. Absolutely mistrusted at the beginning of the year, we finished the year with the praise of all impartial critics. For sensibility, adaptability, and respectability, the Labour Party stood first in the British House of Commons." Admirable! No phrasing of ours could better describe them.

They were a queer party and they are a queer party. On the one side Mr. H. Quelch, of the S.D.F. Executive (who wants to smash the Liberal Party) and lesser lights of that body, not there as representatives of the S.D.F., but sneaking in as trade union delegates; at the other extreme, Mr. R. Bell, M.P., who makes no secret of his Liberalism, risking even his position as trade union official in defence of it, a striking contrast to the servility of Will Thorne and other S.D.F. men, who, because they are trade union officials and might lose their jobs if they refused (so runs the S.D.F. excuse) have been permitted time after time to support Liberal candidates, a crime for which ordinary members of the S.D.F. have been expelled; and between these two, all sorts and conditions of men and women, lacking principle, lacking policy, and therefore an easy prey to the astute and plausible professional politicians who lay in wait for them.

Readers of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD who remember the extent to which the Labour Party candidates made compacts with Liberals at the General Election and pledged themselves in so many directions in order to secure votes, will not be surprised at the effort made to throw over the Party and leave the members in the House free to do as they "darn well please." Their original recommendation, however, was even too strong for some of their most trusted (or cutest) supporters, and it was amended ultimately carried as follows: "That resolutions instructing the Parliamentary Party as to their action in the House of Commons be taken as the opinion of the Conference on the understanding that the time and method of giving effect to these instructions be left to the Party

As they darn well please.

in the House in conjunction with the National Executive." "Respectability and adaptability" indeed! Keir Hardie and A. Henderson complained that the affiliated societies were continually pestering them at their party meetings and, of course, they wished to put a stop to this! Is not this the attitude always taken up by "respectable and adaptable" Liberals and Tories? Conferences may come and go, resolutions may be passed, reforms may be urged or demanded, Newcastle or other programmes may be formulated, but the rank and file, whose votes and work and, in the case of the Labour Party, whose pence have been the means of transforming these "pestered" legislators from mere agitators or carpet baggers into "respectable" esquires, are referred to the exigencies of the political situation and told that, although they may pass resolutions, they must not expect their members (no longer their delegates, but their members) to carry them out. We fear the Labour movement must endure many editions of John Burns before it comes to its senses.

The S.D.F. members made a determined attempt on the second day of the S.D.F. Conference to provide a bridge over which that body might again walk into the ranks of the Labour Party and share its funds for disappointed S.D.F. candidates. These men were not there as delegates of the S.D.F., as we have already pointed out. That body joined the L.R.C. when it was first formed, but afterwards withdrew, for reasons which have been different every time they have endeavoured to explain them. Certain it is they regret their withdrawal and are now pursuing a Jesuitical policy. Despite this withdrawal and despite the fact that the S.D.F. has declared "it is not the business of Socialists to 'permeate' a 'labour' party, any more than the Liberal or Conservative Party," its prominent members are permitted to attend the Conference and its branches are allowed to affiliate to local Labour Parties. Its members are allowed to break its rules by running as Labour Party candidates, thus securing Labour Party Funds, and the S.D.F. itself officially supports "Labour" candidates. The official S.D.F. call this "policy," but neither they nor the rank and file can prove it to be either honest or logical. And so in the names of various trade unions, W. Atkinson, H. Quelch, T. N. Cathrall, J. Gribble, and other S.D.F. men submitted a resolution to make the

A very Ultimate Object. the overthrow of the present system of capitalism and the institution of public ownership and control of the means of life. The mover wished the Party to have "something to attain, something to strive for, something worth striving for," only it must be "ultimate." Don't frighten people by striving for it now! One by one the I.L.P. men rose "as Socialists" to oppose it. Hardie would have voted for it had it been moved in another way. (Oh! respectable and adaptable M.P.), and so on. But Hardie was certainly right, and none knew it better than Quelch & Co., when he pointed out that the people behind the delegates were not Socialists. And by the same token the people behind the "Labour" M.P.s are not Socialists, the victory of the "Lab-

our" candidates was not a victory for Socialism and therefore not a victory for Labour, but, as we showed in our issue last March, a victory for confusion.

Can it be wondered at that a party such as these confusionists should fall victims to the professional politicians and the sections supporting them. The recommendation submitted by the E.C. on the "Temperance" question professed a desire to confer full and unfettered power upon localities for dealing with the licensing question in accordance with local opinion and the rendered this impossible by laying down the definite propositions upon which localities were to vote. If a locality desired free trade in drink, for instance, it could not obtain it under the Labour Party's "full and unfettered power." In short, they fell into the local option trap, as no doubt A. Henderson, D. J. Shackleton and others intended they should.

Although claiming to be concerned with only "practical politics" the labour M.P.s would have no programme drawn up by the Conference. Shackleton put the matter in a nutshell when he declared that if candidates were to be tied down their chances of being returned would be reduced. If, for instance, he and Mr. Gill were compelled to put the abolition of child labour on their programmes they might lose their seats and the society they represented might have to withdraw their payment of £900 per year. And, of course, the delegates decided that £900 sterling and the presence of two such "sensible, respectable and adaptable" men in the House of Commons was much more important than the yearly slaughter of thousands of children in the factory towns the gentlemen represent!

And so the Conference went on, each resolution that was submitted proving how greatly different were the views of the delegates even upon what they regard as "practical politics." And on the last day there occurred the scene that showed what manner of man Keir Hardie is. At a public demonstration held previously at Ulster Hall, he had declared that "they were democrats, they believed in the will of the people." On the last day of Conference a Suffrage resolution was passed with which Hardie disagreed. He immediately showed what kind of a democrat he was, just as he had previously shown what kind of a Socialist he was. He said that if the resolution was intended to restrict the action of the Party in the House, he would have to seriously consider whether he could remain a member. He could not give up his principles, and so on. This was, of course, very pretty, but it was hardly "democratic." Moreover, how greatly Hardie has changed since 1893. In October of that year he was asked to take part in an Adult Suffrage Demonstration in Trafalgar Square, organised by the S.D.F. He declined, accusing the S.D.F. of "desertion of the cause of Socialism." "Is the case of the three million voteless workers," he

Voteless asked, "whose hard lot you are so eager to champion, worse than that of the four million including dependents—workless workers? By your present action you proclaim it to be so, and in this every sweeter in the land

*It is amusing to note that "Justice" has lately arrived at the same conclusion.

will agree with you. Whether the best men among your own members will is another question." But to-day Hardie, having in the meantime become "sensible, respectable and (particularly) adaptable" is quite prepared to put a few thousand propertied women, whose only lack is votes, in front of millions of men, women and children who lack first, last, and always, food.

The attitude of the S.P.G.B. towards the Labour Party remains the same as when our Party was formed. Events have proved that our position is the correct one. We agree with Hardie that you cannot go beyond the position taken up by the people behind you. The people are not yet Socialists. Hardie, Thorne, and the other Labour members did not win their seats on Socialist principles, and therefore cannot fight for those principles in the House. We are opposed to every non-Socialist as well as anti-Socialist party—we are therefore opposed to the Labour Party. Capitalism has nothing to fear from these "sensible, respectable, and adaptable" members of the Labour Party, and the capitalists know it. They are a queer party. A true party of the workers must be a straight party, not a queer one. It must stand for Socialism at, as well as between the elections. It must endeavour to prevent people who are not Socialists voting for its candidates. Neither the S.D.F., I.L.P., nor Labour Party do this. The workers must therefore reject them. This, the straight, uncompromising policy, is the policy of The Socialist Party of Great Britain. The S.P.G.B. is therefore the party of the workers.

J.K.

PARTY NOTES.

The Third Annual Conference will be held on Good Friday and Saturday, March 29th and 30th respectively, at the Communist Club, commencing each day at 10 a.m.

* * *

On Good Friday evening a Social and Dance will be held. Admission by programme, to be obtained from branch secretaries or direct from Head Office.

* * *

Enquiries have been made as to whether membership of Clarion Cycling Clubs is compatible with membership of the S.P.G.B. Were the clubs merely social there would, of course, be no difficulty about the matter, but in point of fact one of the rules of the N.C.C.C. adopted last year at Warwick, specifies "The propagation of principles of Socialism as advocated by the Clarion."

* * *

The "Principles of Socialism as advocated by the Clarion" are the principles of rate-saving municipal capitalism, and state industry on the lines of the Post Office; the transference of capital and the function of the capitalist from the individual to the Public Body.

* * *

A member of the S.P.G.B. would, then, clearly be wrong in joining a Clarion Cycling Club.

* * *

In some walks of life a man is compelled by economic necessity to become a member of an organisation which devotes a small portion of its funds to a political policy as a side line. But there are plenty of purely social clubs, and the member of the S.P.G.B. consequently finds that he need not support a club that is run to advertise a confusionist journal and to propagate an "ism" that is inimical to his class, while in so far as the cycle can be used as an auxiliary to political activity the S.P.G.B. wheelers fill the bill.

* * *

The economic and speakers' classes meet every Thursday evening at the Head Office.

* * *

Our comrades, "the two revolutionaries," are pushing the sale of the Party Organ in the Northern industrial centres, thus performing services to the organisation that will, no doubt, be of material service to us in our endeavour to enlarge the scope of our political activities.

THE BRUTALITY OF THE BOURGEOISIE.

By W. J. GHEST.

From the Toledo "Socialist."

In reading again the story of the Paris Commune, especially in the light of other class conflicts, one is struck afresh with a sense of the ferocious brutality of the bourgeoisie when repelling attacks upon its property. It is not necessary to say that individually the property owner is more brutal than the proletarian. Perhaps he is not. But no informed person can deny that when acting by group or class in defence of its material interests, the bourgeoisie reverts to a bloodthirstiness, an inhumanity, like that of the lowest savages. In such times all the veneer of civilization is sloughed off as a snake sloughs its skin, and the most cruel passions are awakened. It would seem that nothing that men will do in defence of their wives, their state or their religion, can compare, in desperate ferocity, with what they will do in defence of rent, interest and profit.

And, after all, it is by group and class that men are prompted in the larger activities of their lives. Primarily there is a struggle of individual against individual. But this individual struggle pertains to only a part of our activities. The workman competes with the workman for a job; but in all the larger matters that affect him as a member of an economic class, he feels, thinks and acts with his fellows of like needs and aims. And so the trader, tho' he will cheat and rob his fellow trader, will still instinctively feel, think and act with him in all matters wherein his class interests are involved.

In the mob the worst passions are developed. What the individual would never dream of doing alone, he is prompted spontaneously to do when in company with his fellows. "Crowd consciousness" is one thing, "class consciousness" is another. But when the two are met in the same persons, at the same time, there is developed an impulse and a power for evil which spurn ordinary restraints. And when those two are met in the bourgeoisie, repelling attacks upon its possessions, or meting out punishment for a baffled attack, the result is a diabolism of frenzied malice worse than anything which Milton has ascribed to the cohorts of Satan.

It matters not when or where the occasion. At Peterloo in 1819, in Prussia in 1848, in Paris in 1871, in the Cœur de Alene, in Pennsylvania, in Colorado, in Russia, in more recent years, it is all the same. The bourgeoisie will fight among themselves with some show of restraint. The little fellows, under the constant hemming in of their scope and province by the big fellows, are developing a sort of group feeling and community of interest which causes them to battle against the increasing domination of the magnates. But however fiercely the conflict rages, it is restrained by a fundamental sense of a certain likeness of interest. It is only by the attacks of the proletarians on capitalist property, that the real frenzy of the bourgeoisie is awakened; and then every one, from petty retailer to industrial overlord, unites with his fellows in a cry for the defence of property, religion and the state, and for the annihilation of the proletarian aggressors.

The lesson of Colorado is still fresh in most minds. The beatings, the deportings, the killings, the forced starvation of men, women, and children, the overthrow of civil government, combined to illustrate again the instinctive brutality and lawlessness of the bourgeoisie when roused in defence of its possessions and its privileges. But it is to the Commune that one turns for the chief instance. Here was a class conflict on a gigantic scale, and here the frenzy of the bourgeoisie manifested itself as perhaps it never did before. The frightful deeds of the victors are not to be ascribed to racial temperament, as some of our Anglo-Saxon sentimentalists assume. The French can be quite as humane as the English or the Americans. Nor were the deeds done because the Communards were considered traitors. Treason has been a pretty respectable crime in France. The deeds were done because the Communist home rulers were led by men who strove for a better order of society, which involved the abolition of cap-

italism. All the mad ferocity of the bourgeoisie was awakened by this attempted subversion of its material interests, and it slaughtered the victims till its rage was glutted.

The Communards held the city of Paris for a little more than nine weeks. They rapidly and efficiently organized its municipal activity. They suppressed vice and crime; they kept industry and commerce moving. Betrayed on every hand by the agents of the Versailles, they maintained a rare leniency in their treatment of their enemies. From April 3 to May 24, tho' provoked by every manner of brutality and treachery on the part of the Versailles, they did not execute a single prisoner. Only in the last desperate days of the defence, after the Versailles had shot down hundreds of prisoners and of unresisting citizens suspected of sympathy with the Communards, did the latter retaliate. They then executed 63 prisoners out of some 300 in their hands. As frightful as this act appears, it is one in entire accord with the rules of warfare. It has been resorted to in probably every war, and was certainly practised in our Civil War. When one side violates a flag of truce, or executes a prisoner, the other side invariably retaliates in kind.

The Versailles seized the city, and for days gave it up to almost indiscriminate slaughter. Probably 20,000 persons were killed. The number of wounded will never be known. The dead were strewn all over the city. Burial on such a gigantic scale became impossible, and the corpses, saturated with petroleum, were burned in the casemates of the fortifications or in the open air.

Tired with the slaughter, the further ferocity of the bourgeoisie was wreaked upon the hapless victims through the form of "law." More than 40,000 prisoners were taken. Thousands of these, men, women and children, were driven along the roads to Versailles, scourged, beaten and insulted, packed into foul dungeons and stockades, where they were systematically starved. No words can adequately picture the horrors of that time. The worst degraded savages would have shown instincts of humanity superior to those manifested by the victorious bourgeoisie. The "trials" followed, lasting several years, and 13,221 men, 157 women and 62 children were condemned. Two hundred and seventy of these were condemned to death and 7,500 to transportation.

It is from this bourgeoisie, the same in America as in France, that we must take our laws, our institutions, and our moral codes. This class rules, and its intellectual retainers formulate and hand down the principles and precepts of conduct which are obligatory upon all of us. But not for long we hope. As the working class comes gradually to a consciousness of itself, it throws off its ingrained timidity and learns to trust the validity of its own instincts. More and more it learns to condemn the cheap moralities of the bourgeoisie—the "fair weather" moralities which it mouths in times of ease and security, but which it forgets in times of stress. The virtues of usefulness, of fellowship, of magnanimity, which the working class instinctively develops, but which, out of its timidity and subservience to the ruling class, it hesitates to proclaim, come more and more to be the conscious and reasoned bases of its ethical code. And so, as it comes to a full consciousness of itself, it purposes the overthrow of the regime of the bourgeoisie and the installation of an order of society wherein its own code shall have ample field for expression.

And for all its sacrifice of blood it will not retaliate in kind. Out of its instinctive magnanimity, tho' it remembers the massacres, the indescribable cruelties practised upon it by the propertied class, it will obey the injunction of Shelley:

"Do not thus when ye are strong!"

CHILD LABOUR ON FARMS.

It passes one's comprehension that after 100 years' legislation on behalf of factory children, the farmer and other individuals may yet employ younger children than were ever dragged into cotton mills, and may work them for longer hours than were ever known in the history of the factory system!

Co-operative News.

IN DEFENCE OF PROPERTY.

"SOCIALISM: Its Fallacies and Dangers." A collection of papers edited by Frederick Millar. Published by Watts & Co. for the "Liberty and Property Defence League."

-0-

"Let us jealously watch the encroachments of the State, and never suffer it to become more than a watchdog." Such appears to be the political doctrine of the band of belated individualists who are responsible for this book, for they include and condemn under the name of Socialism practically all State activity other than that of the mere policeman. Since, however, the propertied class has in its own interests been compelled to add to the State many other functions than that of the "watch-dog," it is hardly necessary to consider the question at issue as being individualism *versus* collectivism at all, but rather as being—the class which lives by labour *versus* the class which lives by ownership, and whether those who produce should not own and control the product.

To those who seek a clear and useful criticism of Socialist principles the book under review will be disappointing. The facts of industrial evolution are not appreciated. The significance of the huge company and combine, where great and complicated branches of industry are run by hiring workers for absentee shareholders, is not taken into account. Nor is it recognised that industry is developing to the point at which the workers' choice lies only between the oppressive collectivism of the trust or capitalist State for the profit of a few, and the collectivism of democracy for the benefit of all united in producing. The writers place themselves athwart the economic trend, and though as modern Mrs. Partingtons they may be excellent at a slop or a puddle, yet, trundle their mops as they will, they can hardly succeed in checking the rising Atlantic of economic development.

That there are misrepresentations is to be expected from such a source. Thus on page 17 we meet our old and hoary friend, "Sharing Out," Socialism being referred to as the "confiscation and division of the national income." It is also stated that Socialists "maintain that if a man lives in the house of another man, it is an extortion to ask him to pay a rent." But the scientific Socialist knows that, apart from what is called economic rent, house rent is but the price of a commodity that, like every other commodity, tends to exchange at its value, which already includes its proportion of unpaid labour. The Socialist, therefore, holds that the robbery of the worker really takes place in the factory, not on the market.

Those who go into the highways and byways facing the opposition and abuse of the ignorant and the interested, and who, in their championship of the workers against oppression and robbery, brave the malice and persecution of the defenders of property, are told on page 21 that "The root of Socialism is cowardice. Here is the real source of the whole movement. It is the whine and the dream of the weaklings' base fear of rivalry, of competition. It is the duty of real men to circumvent and defeat, by war if necessary, by invasion if necessary, by conquest if necessary, by extermination if necessary, the despicable effeminacy of creatures unworthy of the name of men, because they fear to carry on the competitive struggle in which the true life of manhood consists. The Socialist movement is popular because it appeals to these numerous creatures; panders to their baseness; promises them what they would be ashamed to desire or seek if they were men."

Socialism and the Family.

Next comes the war-cry of the pro-property hypocrite,—"Socialism means the abolition of family life." On this subject the defenders of that class whose heroes fill the divorce courts and whose morals are said to be "of the poultry yard," have only vague innuendo and misrepresentation to offer. But what are the simple facts? The family life of the workers is being destroyed by capitalism through the man, wife and child being forced into the factory to earn the daily bread; and where the home life remains it too often spells brutalising drudgery and ill-temper, owing to the poverty of the wage earner and the great waste of labour entailed

by the individual household. The tremendous saving in drudgery that the co-operative household under Socialism will allow, the improvement in comfort, health, and happiness that it will bring, leave no room for doubt regarding the future of the home, while should any prefer the greater labour and discomfort of the old style, they would certainly be allowed to please themselves.

But what of the relations of men and women? The Socialist knows that the methods of obtaining the material living, and the social order essential thereto, form the foundations of the moral and intellectual life of the time; and that with the changing economic foundation, not only must the relations of individuals to each other change, but their ideas also. The history of family life affords a striking example of this. As Prof. Jenks points out, permanent marriage had its origin in patriarchal society, and was due to no improvement in morality, but to the necessities of the pastoral pursuits of the man, and to his desire to secure for himself exclusively the labour of the woman and her offspring. The wife was bought or captured, and the children were valuable articles of merchandise. The very word "family" is derived from an old Italian word, *famel*, meaning a slave.

From its origin in the institution of property the marriage relationship has reflected the changing needs of property. Children are no longer chattels or assets in the old sense; they are "encumbrances," and paterfamilias' former power of life and death over his household is now restricted to very meagre dimensions. The present marriage contract expresses the needs of the economic dependence of women and children on the man, and becomes an instrument for the control and transmission of property. Mutual affection is quite subordinated to questions of property and income, with the consequent outcrop of hypocrisy, adultery, and unhappiness. While on the one hand the number of men who do not marry is made greater by the insecurity of their lot, on the other hand the number of women who sell themselves on the streets is increased by the inability of many to obtain otherwise even the bare necessities of life.

But when socialisation ends the reign of capitalist property and insecurity, when woman has economic equality with man, and the fear for the children's future is ended by communal life, then the relationship between the sexes ceases to be a property one and becomes human; and who can doubt that modern forms must alter with such change of circumstances, and that the matrimonial market and property contract, with the buying and selling of cohabitation for title and income, must, together with the corollaries of prostitution and domestic misery, become mere memories of a dark past. Who can doubt that the relations between man and woman, when freed of the demoralising influence of economic inequality and vicious social surroundings, will be healthier and purer than ever before—being based no longer on a property transaction or economic compulsion, but upon mutual affection. Yet we are told, among much other nonsense on page 29 of the book under review, that under Socialism "the union of men and women would be an affair of the State, not of mutual regard!"

The Intellectual Few.

On page 54 the reader is told, "the more the origin of wealth is enquired into, the more clearly will the truth appear that wealth is caused by the intelligence of the few, as distinguished from the labour of the many." Now even if this were so it would not bear the inference that the propertied class are the intellectual few reaping the reward of their intellectual labour, for the wealth of the few is accumulated from the purchase and exploitation of both "manual" and "intellectual" workers. But what is the truth regarding the wonderful inventions and improvements which have occurred in industrial processes? Have a series of supermen arisen to produce at each stroke a great wage saving improvement? Herbert Spencer himself has exploded the "great man" theory, and has shown that the great man is the product of his age, whilst the history of industry shows that nearly all improvements have been the result of an accumulation of small inventions which up to a certain point

were ignored or dispised, in spite of their possibilities, because they were not immediately cheaper to work than the older methods. But a last slight improvement, based upon and supplementing the labour of those who had gone before, rendered the new process more profitable than the former methods, and rapidly the features of that industry became transformed. In 1857, Hodge, before a Commission said: "Present spinning machinery is supposed to be a compound of about 800 inventions. The present carding machinery is a compound of about 60 patents."

And those who wrought these improvements, were they rewarded? And were they members of our amazingly intellectual ruling class? They were, indeed, rarely rewarded, while it is almost entirely from men of the working class that the leading inventions have come. J. Burnley, in "The Story of British Trade and Industry," says, "It is a notable fact that the leading inventors of the latter half of the eighteenth century were of the artisan class—humble workers who, in their cottages and little improvised workshops, quietly worked out the mechanical problems which achieved so much for the world, if not for themselves."

John Kay, after inventing the fly shuttle, died a pauper at the end of a few years of ineffectual struggle. Wyatt, who after three years of close effort produced a machine which "spun the first thread of cotton ever produced without the intervention of human fingers," was poor, and allied himself with Lewis Paul, of Birmingham, who promised to finance the invention. Wyatt, however, never benefited by it, for nothing came of the idea until Arkwright revised it at a later date. Another poor inventor, Crompton, set himself to combine the spinning jenny and the water frame. It took him five years of secret experiment, but he eventually succeeded and for a while quietly used his improvement in his own work. Crompton, however, was asked how he managed to spin such fine yarn; he then let the manufacturers into the secret on their subscribing about £50. The firm of which Sir Robert Peel, the grandfather of the statesman, was principal, were the first to make big profits out of the invention, making their machines after Crompton's model. Soon millions of the spindles were working, but Crompton died a few years later in extreme poverty. Such is, indeed, the usual answer of capitalist practice to capitalist theory. The brains of the workers are picked, and their bodily strength exhausted, in order to increase the wealth of those who own the means of living.

The whole argument that "wealth is due to the intelligence of the few" is, in reality, nonsensical. There is no intellectual labour without some degree of manual labour, and no manual labour, however mechanical, that does not imply intellectual labour also. The marketable wealth of the world is not produced otherwise than by labour, intellectual and manual; yet the fact remains that it is a non-producing class who, by their ownership of the means whereby wealth is created, and by their control of political power, are enabled to compel the people to carry on production for them, and to hand over to them all the enormous surplus that remains when the bare necessities of the producers have been grudgingly provided for.

And it is in defence of the title of this owning class to the wealth created by others, that the book under review is published. Well does the League that is responsible for the book deserve to be called, as it is by many working men, the Liberty to Rob Defence League. F.C.W.

Street bookmaking is practically dead; but its place has been taken by bookmaking through the post. This according to a prominent member of the Metropolitan Police force, who has been engaged for twenty-five years in the prosecution of street bookmakers "is the main result of the new Betting Act increasing the penalties for street betting, which came into operation at the beginning of the year.

So that in getting rid of one evil it is questionable whether a greater evil is not being created. Street betting has probably disappeared, but the betting will be carried on just as much as before.

Daily Chronicle.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, subscriptions for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, articles, correspondence, and advertisements submitted for insertion therein should be addressed.—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 28, Cursthorpe St., London, E.C., to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD is published on the first Saturday in each month.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office every Tuesday at 7 p.m. The Office is open every Saturday until 4 p.m.

Terms of Subscriptions.

UNITED KINGDOM.			
Twelve Months	1s 6d
Six Months	9d
AMERICA.			
Twelve Months	50 cents.
Six Months	25 cents.

Scale of Charges for Advertisements.

	£	s.	d.
Per Inch, One Insertion
Quarter Column do.
Half Column do.
One Column do.

Special arrangements will be made for Advertisements to be inserted in more than one issue.

The Socialist Standard,



SATURDAY, MAR. 2, 1907.

Progress!

The 1905 criminal statistics recently issued from the Home Office show that while there is a decline in convictions for drunkenness, manslaughter, bigamy and malicious wounding, there is nevertheless a significant increase in burglaries and crimes against property with violence. Sir John Macdonell says in his summary: "The enormous preponderance of crimes against property is remarkable: nearly nine-tenths of the whole fall every year within that category."

Indictable offences have increased from a yearly average of 51,612 during 1896-1900 to 61,463 in 1905. While, instead of drink being the cause of crime, drunkenness has declined while crime has increased. The statistics are eloquent of the dependence of crime on economic conditions, the increase in crime coinciding with greater distress and unemployment among the people. The accumulation of property into few hands and the corresponding lack of the means of existence among the many lead irresistibly to what are called crimes against property, and the Socialist is not surprised to find that the year of acutest distress and unemployment among the workers was at the same time "a record year of National Prosperity."

Truly there is progress and prosperity, but it is not for the workers—yet; and instead of the class cleavage becoming less marked it daily grows wider.

To abolish the contradictions and antagonisms of interest that exist, the working class must gain control of Society and dispossess the owners of capital so that unity of interest may be secured by the participation of *all* in production. Those, however, who think of securing the support of those whose superior position depends upon the slavery of the workers, must, if honest, be ignorant of the lessons of history and of everyday experience.

Thus Mr. Keir Hardie tried to assure the Cambridge undergraduates recently that "Socialism was not a class movement." "Down with it!" they cried. "Many of the Socialists' most enthusiastic advocates are university men,"

shouted Keir Hardie. "Shame!" howled the undergraduates. "These men and women from the middle and upper classes realise that there is something more sacred than property," continued Hardie. "Rot!" yelled the gowmsmen; and there is no doubt that the undergraduates differ in no essential from the generality of their class.

The Sweets of Rusticity!

A recent enquiry into the housing conditions of a small Hertfordshire village known as Chipperfield has apparently been greatly agitating the *Daily News* and our pro-stock exchange, anti-gambling, nonconformist contemporary is of course mightily shocked at the revelations which have been made as to the unhappy state in which the villagers, or some of them, exist so far as their lodgement is concerned. Most of the houses in which the agriculturist (the backbone of England's greatness—see Tariff Reform Handbook) has his abode, have no sanitary conveniences; many of them are in bad repair (in one case it is alleged that the happy tenant would go to bed on wet nights with an umbrella up!) and there is the usual scarcity with its inevitable overcrowding and comparatively high rents.

Excepting, perhaps, the somewhat novel feature of an umbrella protected bedroom, these are not unusual features of village life. Few villages indeed can boast of being free from all of them. They are just complementary to the private ownership of the land and housing accommodation, and there is no adequate and final remedy apart from the complete abolition of such private ownership and the extirpation of the capitalist and land-owning class. Conceivably the local authority could erect sanitary and well constructed houses even under present conditions, but as the obsession peculiar to local authorities is comprised in the necessity for showing a profit on any work of this character they may undertake, and as the great labour statesman at the head of the Local Government department has expressed his strong disapproval of any suggestion of increased indebtedness (and thereby earned the "well done good and faithful servant" of his capitalist paymasters) it is hardly conceivable, under present conditions, that the local authority would let any house erected by them at a rental within the possibilities of the agriculturist's attenuated purse.

What generally happens is that houses are erected ostensibly for those in want of them, and let to those for whom they are not supposed to be intended, because these last only are in a position to pay the rental demanded. That is to say that in practice the Housing of the Working Classes Act is, like most other capitalist "working-class" Acts—a fraud.

The agriculturists of Chipperfield and elsewhere will therefore—unless it suggests itself as it very well may to the local authority or local landowner as good business to lose a little on the swings in order to get it back on the roundabouts—have to continue pigging together until such time as better housing accommodation is thrown to them as a sop to stay their conscious progress toward that Socialism which is the only sure cure for housing and other economic ills. Hopeless though it may seem, the agriculturist will have to organise himself in company with his town bred fellow for the overthrow of capitalist domination. There is no other way.

Now that the propaganda season is upon us comrades should throw redoubled vigour into the work of pushing the sale of the Party Organ and other Party literature. No more effective work can be performed for Socialism.

The Lessons of the German Elections.

The most important lesson to be derived from the results of the recent elections in Germany is the fact that where the workers once attain full class-consciousness they can no longer be misled by the juggling and somersaults of the capitalist class. We therefore value election campaigns and political representation only in so far as they are a means for rousing the workers to full class-consciousness. The organised forces of labour cannot gain permanent economic or social advantages unless they are prepared to seize the political machinery with the view to socialising the means of production and will back such effort by force to the degree of capitalist resistance. We also know that with the development of capitalism economic pressure is continually increasing and class-consciousness is forced on ever wider circles of the proletariat.

Looking at things from the above standpoint we are neither discouraged by the loss of 38 Parliamentary seats to the German Socialist Party, nor are we unduly elated by the increase of close upon 250,000 votes gained by the Socialist candidates. We are merely concerned with the extent to which class-consciousness has grown among the working class of Germany, and while we deem it our duty to condemn in Germany, as at home, the policy of compromise and reform, we are ever ready to recognise the value of propaganda work from the uncompromising standpoint wherever such is persistently and unflinchingly pursued, and to note the pleasant fact that a small but steadily growing faction of the German Party has for some years put forward a tremendous effort to induce the Party to abandon its policy of reform and compromise. We are, however, compelled to state after considering all the circumstances, that the German Socialist Party have pursued and are still pursuing a policy that has resulted in conveying a false impression as to the real extent of class-consciousness among the German proletariat.

When the results of these elections became known, the capitalist class and their reptile Press in Germany and abroad naturally announced for the benefit of the many millions of still class-unconscious wage-slaves that Socialism has been hopelessly shattered, although the increase of nearly a quarter-of-a-million of votes for the Socialist candidates did not exactly furnish proofs for such a sweeping allegation. On the other hand the Socialist papers in Germany brought explanations for the Socialist reverses, showing exhaustively the influences traceable to ignorant hangers-on and factions of the capitalist class, but omitting, almost without exception, any allusion to the most important reason of all, viz., the influence of mistaken policy and tactics, in which compromise and reform played so significant a part. Being unable to accept these inadequate explanations which were in most cases put forth with dignity and caution, we naturally scorn the childish abuse levelled by some of the would-be Socialist organs in this country at the "blatant bourgeoisie of Germany." H. M. Hyndman, for instance, in *Justice* of February 2nd, 1907 says: "The Radicals in Germany, as elsewhere, are a cowardly set, physically and morally, but they may be compelled to join with the Social-Democrats and the Centre in opposing the Kaiser's efforts to turn the world upside down." When we mention that the same author has stated that the workers will be emancipated by a class above them, and that not so very long ago he appealed to the Radicals through the columns of *Reynolds* to join with the S.D.F. in promoting measures of reform, our readers will feel more amused than surprised at the above.

Insisting upon the truth that the working-class must emancipate itself from wage-slavery, we must confess that to us the most pleasing feature of these last elections is that all factions of the capitalist class without exception have at last thrown over all pretence of compromise with the Socialist Party and have actually compelled the latter to look for support to themselves alone. In face of this fact are the German Socialists prepared to tell us that they could not of their own accord long ago have taken up the position now practically forced upon them? Or, are they ready to solicit capitalist compromise as heretofore?

When soon after the last General Election in

this country we were constrained to protest against Comrade Bebel's action in sending a compromising telegram to *Reynolds*, on the grounds that it interfered with our propaganda, the *Socialist*, of S.L.P. renown, in its ardent desire to make us appear ridiculous, took up the defence of Bebel and said that the German Socialist Party were bound to compromise with the capitalist class, owing to the backwardness of the economic development in Germany. How strange that within twelve months of this incident the economic development in Germany has experienced such marvellous impetus that all the factions of the capitalist class, including even the Radicals, can afford to renounce all compromise with the Socialist Party! So much for the wise-aces of the *Socialist*.

The German Socialist Party itself admits the necessity and immediate possibility of relying solely upon the support of the proletariat. In *Vorwarts* of February 9th, 1907, an editorial article entitled, "The lessons of the Reichstag Elections" concludes with the following:—

"Whether the stage of social development in the Germany of to-day is such as to already make possible the realisation of the Socialist aim, is a futile question. This aim cannot be reached by one stroke; it presupposes transition stages. But that the division of classes created by the social development has progressed to that extent that the non-possessing class by virtue of their majority in numbers could conquer political power and produce the democratic and social preliminary conditions for the transition to Socialism, would be denied only by those who have not the least inkling of the statistics relating to occupations and incomes. For the Socialist Party it is only a question of making the majority of the non-possessing class conscious of their class position, of awakening the proletariat to class consciousness! That, however, can only be accomplished by the class struggle itself, by incessant warfare against the capitalist system, and not by concessions to capitalism."

After this frank admission on the part of the German Socialist Party the Editor of the *Socialist* should take a back seat.

The aforementioned excerpt, however, not only, as far as the German Socialist Party is concerned, demonstrates to the full a discrepancy between its practical pursuance of the class struggle and the admittedly only correct attitude, but it also gives most concisely the gist of the awkward and flimsy arguments used persistently by the S.D.F. and I.L.P. in defence of their advocacy of capitalist palliatives and reforms. It is certainly most ingenious on the part of *Vorwarts* to make the need of transition stages the excuse for the advocacy of reforms and palliatives. What the workers (and that means the whole of Society) will do after the proletariat have seized control of the political machinery is a totally different question to what the wage-slave class must do to be emancipated.

If in 1903 the German Socialist Party succeeded in winning 81 seats in the Reichstag, it was merely due to the fact that many thousands of Radical bourgeois voted for Socialist candidates because they judged from the great stir the Revisionists were then making that the Socialist Party would at its Congress in Dresden in August embrace Revisionism and abjure the Social Revolution for ever. And on being rudely disappointed in their expectations these former allies of Bernstein, Calver, and Co. returned to their own flock at the recent election; hence the loss of all the seats, which were formerly obtained by a mere snatch-vote among Radicals.

The first great blunder of the German Party is in retaining the revisionists, men who were, and still are, working for the fusion of bourgeois democrats with Socialist wage-workers. Then the false attitude on the colonial question of opposing colonisation in South West Africa on the grounds that it would not be profitable, instead of showing that the colonial policy meant nothing but an extension of the sphere of exploitation abroad, to the detriment of the wage-slaves at home. It was solely because the Centre Party succeeded in getting the Socialists to take up the same position as the Clericals regarding the colonial policy that the Centre was able to precipitate the Dissolution which suited its ends admirably. Helped by the false attitude of the Socialists, the Centre Party was triumphant all along the line and increased its number of members in the Reichstag as well as its

number of votes.

Another source of weakness was the items of purely bourgeois reform on the program of the German Party. This attracted pro-capitalist voters and unreliable supporters, whereas a straightforward declaration of their revolutionary principles would have kept away those who could only be a cause of confusion and weakness. The contradictory tactics pursued at the second ballot as compared with the first were unworthy of a great worker's party. At the first ballot the order was hostility to all capitalist factions, but at the second ballot those Clerical or Radical candidates who gave an undertaking not to support interference with the franchise or right of combination of the workers, were officially recommended as deserving of Socialist support. And last, but by no means least, we have to condemn the efforts of the German Socialist Press for threatening the workers with a possible increase in rates and taxes, if they supported certain factions of the capitalist class. Seeing that rates and taxes form part of the surplus value robbed from the workers, that the workers during the most prosperous periods can obtain only a subsistence, it is nothing short of a crime to make the wage-workers believe that the question of rates and taxes can have any bearing on their position as wage-slaves. And it may perhaps interest our readers if we inform them that a few days before the election, *Vorwarts* published a series of articles entitled: "The burden of taxation of the German and English workers," wherein the position of the English workers was described as comparatively much better off than the German workers, "because of the greater burdens of taxation borne by the latter." What wonder that the more cunning of the capitalist class, especially the Clericals and Radicals, joyfully seized upon this declaration of the Socialists, and, promising the workers immediate relief in respect of the pressure of rates and taxes supposed to be endured by them, succeeded in obtaining in that way a great number of working-class votes.

Considering the confusion caused in the minds of the German workers by the many false issues raised even by the Socialist Party, it is, of course, not possible to speak precisely regarding the number of workers who would be prepared to back the social revolution all the time. But there is every reason to believe that in at least the twelve constituencies where the Socialist vote was in 1903 between 52 to 58 per cent. of the electorate, and where at the recent elections there has been throughout an increase of 2 to 3 per cent., that there are many who thoroughly understand the working-class position. 18 other constituencies were also won at the first ballot, in which the Socialist vote was about half the total. Among the 21 constituencies lost at the second ballot there were 14 which had been won in 1903 at the first ballot with between 40 and 50 per cent. of the poll. Two constituencies, Breslau West, hitherto represented by Edward Bernstein; and Zschopau-Gleichen, until a few months ago represented by Schippel, who resigned, were plainly lost because the Revisionist Radicals were disgusted with the attitude taken up by the Party at their Dresden Congress and also because a number abstained from voting in order to shake off revisionist Bernstein.

It is true that the German Socialist Party has nothing to grumble at from the truly Socialist, that is the propaganda standpoint, seeing that of the 662,323 votes recorded in excess of the number given in 1903, the Socialist Party received 248,197. And if we consider that the Party vote has become much more proletarian and less weak-kneed owing to thousands of Radicals leaving the Socialist ranks, we are justified in saying that the result of the recent election is by far sounder and more hopeful than that of 1903.

We should only be able to gauge the extent of class consciousness among the German workers if the Party would throw overboard all reforms and compromise and, organising the workers in the political and economic field on the lines of the class struggle alone, would offer a united front of revolutionary hostility to the possessing class.

There is no gainsaying that the German Party possesses the material needful for such a fight: many good speakers, writers and organisers, 60

daily, 15 weekly, and 27 trades' papers and ammunition galore in other directions. Let us hope that the criticism given in a far comradely spirit, will be of some assistance in bringing the oldest section of the international labour movement to the reconsideration of their tactics and their adopting in the near future a position of "no compromise," and of hostility to capitalism every time and all the time.

H.F.N.

DOUBTS AND DIFFICULTIES.

WHY EVERY OTHER PARTY IS HOSTILE TO THE S.P.G.B.

Jan. 7th, 1907.

To the Executive of the S.P.G.B.

Whilst thanking you for the courtesy with which your contributor dealt with my "Doubts and Difficulties" in the December issue, I beg leave to put one or two more points. In the first place allow me to say that when I stated that I accepted your Declaration of Principles as a sound basis of waging the class struggle, I did not accept that portion of it which, it now appears, declares war on other Socialists. Because they are not of your party; but because it was hostile, as I then understood it, to the two capitalist parties. Truly the S.D.F., the I.L.P., and the Fabian Society are political parties; but they are *avowed* Socialist Parties. The Liberal and Tory Parties are not. You must admit that when they take on themselves the title of "Socialist," they all have one end in view, viz., the common ownership of *all the forces* requisite for man's necessity. But the capitalist parties never advocate such measures. That to me is where the whole difference lies. The quarrel between Socialists appears to me as ridiculous as the sham-fighting between Liberal and Tory. There is no difference between *their* interests; and where is the difference of interest with Socialists? There can only be a difference of tactics. Therefore if you cannot conscientiously help other Socialist parties why not cease to harp on the little good they may be doing; and instead, use the time, space and energy in fighting the capitalists, and exposing their alluring promises, etc. It would at least keep the issue clearer.

My respondent does not think I am justified in saying that you should recognise everybody and everything making for Socialism. I did not say that. The next sentence is thus: "We fully recognise that every action of every party, person, or economic force is *making for Socialism*." Then, how can you say you do not? Now, I said, "assist everyone aiming at Socialism," irrespective of party or religion, etc. "Economic" then asks, "How are we to recognise them?" Why by respect and toleration, if not help.

My reply owes his conversion to Herbert Spencer and asks how is *he* to be recognised, and *his* types. Well, I suggest you should recognise him by advising others to read his works also, pointing out that he was only a learned philosopher, not an infallible god; for if one intelligent man can be brought to the light that way, why not others? Tell the people to read all sides; the truth never suffers, and the more sure the result. Intelligent Socialists are not made by reading socialistic literature alone, but by thinking broadly on all subjects.

You say you do not attack Socialists of the S.D.F. because they are such. But, where there is a meeting, your party, instead of keeping quiet and hearing if the speaker is unscientific, get up in deliberate opposition, as though he were a fraud, while he *may* be a more able speaker, temperately, than your own supporter. One of the crowd hears both speakers, and can't for the life of him make out what the two parties exist for, much less what the quarrel is.

But I must not intrude on your generosity for space. There are many points I should have liked to have contested in the reply, but I refrain. But I put this to you: would it be wise for me to leave my trade society, and start another on my own account, because I did not get satisfaction for my endeavours, great or small? Would it not be better to remain inside, and by persistent propaganda in the branch, monthly report, or workshop, try to secure a

majority of those who think as I do, and thereby alter the government of it?

That is how I look at the action of your party; to say nothing of the split that has occurred, as I foreshadowed in my previous letter. Verily, to accomplish Socialism—make Socialists. For Socialism, to be successful, must be directed by intelligence; but the bulk of the people are ignorant, and to place ignorance in power would be to establish a system more terrible and tyrannical than the present. Therefore, however much you may disagree with what you term palliatives, such as feeding the children before "educating" them, healthier dwellings, municipal buildings, shorter hours, increase of wages, etc., bear in mind that most of them are economic advances; and only by this means will the people gradually become intellectually, morally, and physically fit to wield the power they will possess, safely, securely and permanently. It will take a long time, but slowly and surely the race will be run.

Yours very fraternally,
FREDK. W. TOD.

92, Duckett Road, Harringay.

The break down of the feudal system of wealth production was necessitated by the growth within it of a new system of production under which the worker was divorced from his means of production. The new society evolved from the old and worked at first harmoniously with it, but a time came when the forces of the new industrial system were hindered by, and became antagonistic to, the powers of the old. An inevitable struggle ensued and, inevitably, the old society had to go.

The new mode of production brought in its train an entire revolution in the conceptions of mankind arising from entirely fresh conditions of wealth production. The development of this society, with its introduction of machine produced wealth, its dependence of the worker upon the owner of the machine, its placing political power in the hands of the machine-owning or capitalist class, has gone with the development of the antagonisms latent within it. Machine owner against wage worker, profit against wages, capitalist class against working-class interest—these oppositions made necessary the growth of a working-class political party fighting against the ruling powers controlling the administration of the nation.

Such a political party of the workers made necessary by the oppositions of class must have as an objective the capturing the political machine. But to what purpose? So as to so administer the affairs of the community that every man should be ranked among the workers and that the production of wealth and its distribution should be socially controlled in the interest and for the welfare of the whole people.

Such a party must be a Socialist party. Further, it must be a working-class party. Only the working class can work out working-class emancipation. The past history of class warfare shows that political power is wrested by each successive class in the social strata which then absorbs within itself the former ruling class and refuses to share its power with the class below. Only one class now remains—the working class—and it, too, must finally wrest power from the hands of the capitalist class and thereby absorbing that class, secure the abolition of all class. This strife for dominion can end only when classes have ceased to be.

The class strife, of which I have just spoken, must be mainly political, but alongside the political struggle must go *pari passu* the economic organisation of the working class. On each field of the struggle they must be prepared. The class strife manifests itself in a struggle on the political plane which involves the building up of a political organisation prepared to capture all the powers of government.

Being a class struggle nothing can be hoped for from either of the capitalist political parties. Hence any alliance or agreement with them must

necessarily hinder the emancipation of the working class and confuse the class issue. Whether such an alliance or agreement is entered into in local or in national politics the end to be gained, even if gained, must remain of less importance than the keeping a clear class issue before the working class.

We have therefore to recognise (1) a class strife, manifesting itself in (2) a politico-economic struggle for power on the part of the workers, necessitating (3) a Socialist Parliamentary political party fighting for Socialism and for all that Socialism implies. This fight must be without hope of aid from the other political parties whose interests harmonise with the maintenance of the present class society. We have also to recognise the impossibility of securing the palliation of the present capitalist society, except at the hands of a Socialist Party Government. When you have a Socialist Party Government in power you will find that they do not mean to allow the capitalist regime to exist sufficiently long to need palliation. They will rear a new society rather than patch up an old; revolutionise and not reform.

Any political party, then, call it by whatever name you will, which has a palliative programme is a party which seeks the assistance of a political party of capitalist texture. They can only carry any palliative measure on their programme by the aid of the capitalist government. To have such a hope says little for their understanding of the class war. Such a programme is the first step towards alliances and agreements, and we cannot, therefore, experience much surprise when we find that every political party other than The Socialist Party of Great Britain has entered into such alliances and agreements. Such parties are a danger to the Socialist movement in this country and must be opposed and exposed.

It is of no avail asking why we could not have remained in this or the other party with a view to rectifying their errors. We have made every possible effort in that direction but have signally failed. We know that there are many earnest, self-sacrificing Socialists in those parties among the rank and file, but so long as they support their present parties their Socialism is of little utility to the furtherance of Socialism in this country.

Again we criticise the actions of those parties and of the members of those parties in detail—and apart from their erroneous basic principles—whenever we find them inconsistent with Socialism. We criticise, not so much from any expectation that they will act differently, but, so that our readers may clearly understand the course of conduct these parties pursue.

My critic, Mr. Tod, thinks that we should recognise men like Spencer by advising people to read his books, and parties like the S.D.F., I.L.P., Fabian Society, and Labour Party by toleration if not by help. We have no objection to people reading Spencer's "Synthetic Philosophy" or even the organs of these organisations. I do not see, however, why we should advise them to do so. The party of reaction is sufficiently strong without our aiding it by giving such advice. In giving the readers of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD advice as to books to study we shall be governed by what we consider best for Socialism and by no other motive whatsoever.

But toleration if not help! Toleration of compromise!! Of the denial of the class war!!! Surely not. The difference between The Socialist Party of Great Britain and the parties which Mr. Tod takes under his wing is not merely difference in tactics, but is a difference in the underlying principles upon which those tactics are based. As an example I may again point out that our principles determine that we are the only political party in Great Britain which has from its inception rejected a palliative programme.

It is not that we are opposed to such desir-

able objects as the free feeding of children, or the free feeding, housing, clothing, &c. of adults. It is that we are firmly convinced that nothing which can materially benefit the working class will ever be given by the one and only capitalist political party. If there were two capitalist political parties we might—but I trust not.

For there is but one capitalist political party—the Liberal-Tory Party. They are like unto a wedded couple. Bound in the ties of holy matrimony their essential interests are the same. Like all married couples they have their petty differences. Seek, however, to gain an influence over either, or to side with either, or to obtain an advantage detrimental to either, and we soon learn to "beware the redding stroke," for they twain are of one flesh.

I may conclude my remarks arising from Mr. Tod's letter with the following quotation from Wilhelm Liebknecht:

"On the ground of the class struggle we are invincible; if we leave it we are lost, because we are no longer Socialists. The strength and the power of Socialism rests in the fact that we are leading a class struggle; that the labouring class is exploited and oppressed by the capitalist class, and that within capitalist society effectual reforms, which will put an end to class government and class exploitation, are impossible.

"We cannot traffic in our principles, we can make no compromise, no agreement with the ruling system. We must break with the ruling system and fight it to a finish. It must fall that Socialism may arise, and we certainly cannot expect from the ruling class that it will give to itself and its domination the death blow. The International Working Men's Association accordingly preached that 'the emancipation of the labouring class must be the work of the labourers themselves.'"

Thus by these words of wisdom we are justified.

ECONOMICS.

Of all the Western industries introduced into Japan, the one which has made the most rapid progress is, says *Engineering*, that of cotton-spinning and manufacturing. Its products are also those which compete most directly with the corresponding British manufactures. Some of the most enterprising men of the Japanese Empire control the factories; and behind the young industry is the whole force of the paternal Government urging it on. There are 49 cotton-spinning companies in Japan, operating eighty-five mills. At present Japanese mills are making profits, not because of any special skill of their operatives, but simply on account of the difference in price between the raw materials and the simplest forms of manufactures therefrom. It is simply a question of keeping the belt on the tight pulley; and that they are doing this to the fullest extent is shown by the fact that for the last six months of the period covered by this report, 81 out of 85 mills ran both night and day, and averaged over 22 hours a day.

The *Law Journal*, referring to the question raised in the music-hall strike whether pickets, whose proceedings lead to the gathering of crowds in the streets can be fined under the provisions of the Highway Act, 1835, having regard to the fact that peaceful picketing is legal under the provisions of the Trades Disputes Act, says it should have supposed that the section was intended to take away doubts as to the legality of picketing itself, and not to make the pickets entitled to over-ride public rights as well as molest individuals in the course of a trade dispute. If Mr. Atherley Jones's reading of the Trades Disputes Act is correct, pickets would be entitled to trespass on private property in furtherance of their trade dispute.

The report of the debate between J. Fitzgerald (S.P.G.B.) and E. J. B. Allen (S.L.P.), which took place at Plumstead recently is unavoidably held over until next month on account of the pressure on our space.

LITERARY CURIOSITIES.

No. 5.—E. E. HUNTER IN SACKCLOTH AND ASHES.

Stratford Socialist Club,
3, Well Street,
Stratford, E.
3rd April, 1906.

To the Members and Branches
of the Social Democratic Federation.

Dear Comrades,—In April 1903 I was expelled from the S.D.F. Early in the present year I applied for re-admission to the Stratford Branch, and they accepted me subject to the consent of the Executive Council. They, however, have withheld that consent, and writing on March 6th, comrade H. W. Lee informs me "that they (the E.C.) do not see their way to grant such application at the present time."

The Stratford Branch are now appealing against this decision to the Annual Conference at Bradford, and it is in support of this appeal, and in order to explain my position that I pen this letter.

During the three years that have elapsed since my expulsion there are, of course, many of my actions that the S.D.F. can legitimately call me to account for, and as I was fully aware of this fact I requested the E.C. to allow me to attend their meeting with a view to coming to an understanding upon such matters. I duly attended the meeting, and made a statement fully dealing with my reasons, and my attitude as regards my past relations with the S.D.F. Several questions were asked including one by comrade Quench as to whether I was willing to put in writing what I had said to them. I replied that I was perfectly willing if they so desired it. This I now do.

As distinct from my criticisms of the organisation, I have made certain charges against the party and individuals which were simply founded on hypothesis. These I unreservedly withdraw. Where these charges have caused pain to comrades, I can only express my regret, and trust that loyal work for the party in the future will efface any feelings of bitterness that may remain. One thing I would emphasise in fairness to myself, and those whom up till October last were my colleagues, that at any rate we were conscientious and sincere. Personally I am thoroughly convinced that the "impossibilist" movement in so far as it developed into a revolt against the real organisation of revolutionary Socialism in Great Britain was a great and grievous error.

Experience has taught me that it is an impossibility to build a party in which every unit shall, temperamentally, economically and politically toe a given line. The party of the workers must be one that always keeps the class standpoint in view, that politically stands in antagonism to all the sections of the capitalist class, and that always keeps to the front the vital principles of the social revolution. The S.D.F. fits these qualifications, and is therefore the party to which should rally the class-conscious Socialist of the country. On minor questions that deal with the policy to be adopted in relation to this or that palliative, or reform of capitalist society there may be legitimate differences of opinion, but as long as there is no sinking of principle involved the drawing of a hard and fast line is apt to disintegrate the movement by enforcing cast-iron discipline in small things that are not vitally important. The same remarks apply to my attitude towards alliances, temporary or otherwise, for a specific purpose. As long as such an alliance does not hide our principles, and the object of the alliance is good in an agitational sense, such an alliance is of utility; as soon, however, as it has tendency to smother the party's principles, and associate it with dubious company it becomes dangerous. I am convinced, however, that the S.D.F. has sufficient political acumen to discriminate between good and bad alliances.

I trust that this confession of faith will help to clear the air. In the main, I, of course hold that the Socialist movement progresses in equal ratio to its independence and sturdy clearness of utterance. The more clearly it is able to define its position, the more it gathers to itself all that

is best and strongest in the working class. On these lines the S.D.F. has fought, and its strong position to-day after all its expulsions and secessions is ample justification for its existence. The S.D.F. undoubtedly represents the revolutionary working class, and it is folly to hinder its way with carping criticism, and spiteful opposition.

In conclusion I trust that the comrades will fully consider my application, and by endorsing my membership of the Stratford Branch, put an end my wandering in the wilderness.

Fraternally yours,
ERNEST E. HUNTER.

FROM THE FIGHTING LINE.

WEST HAM.—Fair to middling. Little to rejoice at except increase of membership, and little to complain of but the apathy of the workers. Our success, of course, is equal to our power to command it, and that both may increase we have now reason to hope. The central classes for which we have yearned and worked are now an accomplished fact, and so far we can confidently recommend them to the careful consideration of the comrades who are still young or at least are not too old to learn. The Hammers look forward to meeting members of all the branches at this intellectual *renue* of the Party. We already feel the benefit in our own classes of the stimulus of "something done," in the way of co-ordination of intellectual effort.

G.C.H.C.

TOOTING.—The working class can be united in demanding Socialism, but the reform has yet to be named that does not succeed in dividing their interests more or less. The I.L.P. manifesto on the L.C.C. elections which contains as one of its principal planks that revolutionary reform "A Municipal Milk Supply" is a case in point. Four Tooting milkmen, who had just commenced to take an interest in Socialism, saw this reform alluded to in the daily Press as "a Socialist demand"; and knowing full well that it would mean that at the most only one fourth of their number would be required to deliver milk under that system, they, on meeting one of our speakers recently, charged him with seeking a reform which would put three-fourths of their number out of work. It will take our comrade more than one evening to convince those milkmen that neither municipal capitalism nor the I.L.P. have anything to do with Socialism except in so far as the I.L.P. preaches confusion under that name.

The Wandsworth Trades and Labour Council are affording ample justification for the attitude of the Party in running candidates for the Borough Council against theirs last November. According to the aforesaid Labour Council neither the Progressives nor the Rev. Anderson (Tory) were then able to represent the interests of the workers, so they opposed them with candidates of their own. Somehow the L.C.C. elections have altered the complexion of affairs. First the Trades Council held a meeting for the purpose of hearing an address by Mr. Kellaway, the Progressive candidate. This not affording complete satisfaction, they invited the Rev. Anderson to run in *their* interest. He declining they finally decided by 21 votes to 14 to support the Progressive, Mr. Kellaway!

This is independence as practised by Labour groups affiliated to the Labour Party. Opposition to all sections of the capitalist class at all times is the only attitude that will ever release the working class from its present bondage; and many outside our membership are beginning to see the impregnability of our position, in which mental transformation they are being assisted by the vacillating policy of the Wandsworth Trades Council, who have shown so completely that they neither know where they are nor where they are going.

P.D.

PADDINGTON.—Once again the Paddington Borough is seething with political manifestations, having arisen out of the Slough of Despond into which it had been plunged since the last general election. Progressives and Moderates, aspirants for municipal honours, appear before the working class in this and other dis-

tricts, clamouring for votes, each party stirring up the emotions of the working class with vague promises that can never be fulfilled while capitalism lasts, even if they wanted to fulfill them.

When the polling day arrives the climax will be reached, the Progressives or the Moderates will be announced as the victors. The glib-tongued politicians having had their purpose served (viz., the perpetuation of capitalism) will disappear from the public gaze, and the majority of the working class having trusted their own interest to another class, will consider their duty done and await another general uprising in capitalist politics.

In distinct contrast to this flash in the pan, we, the Paddington members, assemble every Sunday morning throughout the year at the junction of the Waltherton Road and Elgin Avenue, for the purpose of discussing political and economic questions of vital interest to the working class. We make no promises as to what we will do for them, we solicit no favours from them, nor ask them to support us, but to support themselves by combining with us. For working-class emancipation can only arise from working-class activities being directed in a scientifically organised way by that class itself. We invite all, of every shade of political opinion, to come and analyse the position we take up, and to ask questions of us. For the conclusion we draw from past experience is that the future belongs to us, for ours is the way, the truth, and the light.

T.A.W.

PHILANTHROPY AND PROFITS.

The real nature of the pretendedly disinterested benevolence of some large employers is at times laid bare even in the journals of the enemy, and capitalist "philanthropy" is then found to have a very material basis. The Berlin correspondent of the *Daily Chronicle* has, for example, after a visit to Essen, the following to say regarding the famous firm of Krupp:—

"Krupps are honourably known for the patriarchal benevolence which they display towards their workpeople. Their model dwellings, their sick-clubs, their co-operative stores, and a great variety of other institutions to alleviate the lot of their workers, have often been described, and always in terms of adulation. For my part, I carried away a different impression. I felt that all the mature thought bestowed by the famous firm on their benevolent institutions was the result of sound business principles, tinged by despotism, rather than the manifestation of any special leanings towards philanthropy. This is the opinion of a large body of their own employees who regard the many admirably-conducted institutions as so many chains binding the men to the firm. The chains are covered with cotton wool, but that does not impair their strength; it only makes them less galling. A concern like Krupp's could not afford to have a large body of their workmen disaffected; a strike could have most disastrous consequences."

With my Socialist friend I visited several of the model dwelling-houses, and found much to admire, but a good deal also to criticise. Rents on the whole were high, and I found a far larger proportion of the tenements than I had expected anything but comfortable. Indeed, in too many cases the dwellings looked gloomy, forbidding, and absolutely devoid of homeliness and comfort. The colonies known as Schederhof and Nordhof were dreary and squalid in the extreme. An incessant guard, moreover, is kept over the men that they do not live a life outside the works which is displeasing to their employers. Their political activities, for example, are very narrowly scrutinised. Every workman on entering Krupp's employ must sign a document of portentous length, in which his work and his play are both regulated. He must, for example, sign that he will not attach himself to any political organisation which has as its object the upheaval of existing social or political institutions. As Socialism in the eyes of Krupp is synonymous with revolution, this means that any workman known as a Socialist is summarily dismissed."

The receipt of a copy of this paper is an invitation to subscribe. Back numbers can always be had from branch secretaries or any of the retail agents.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

HERBERT SPENCER'S ESSAYS.—A selection containing among others the valuable essay on "Mill versus Hamilton: The Test of Truth" and the essay on "The Genesis of Science." Watts & Co., 6d.

THE SECRET OF HERRARI.—An essay on education by E. H. Hayward. Watts & Co., 6d.

REPORT OF GUILDHALL CONFERENCE ON A MINIMUM WAGE.—Issued by the National Anti-Sweating League. 97 pp., 6d.

BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, &c. to be obtained of the S.P.G.B., 28, Cursitor St., London, E.C.

CAPITAL (Karl Marx) ... 5s. 6d.

SIX CENTURIES OF WORK AND WAGES (Thorold Rogers) ... 5s. 6d.

POVERTY (Rowntree) ... 4s. 6d.

SOCIALIST STANDARD

Vols. I. & II (Bound) each ... 3s. 0d.

MANIFESTO and RULES of the S.P.G.B. ... 1½d.

FROM HANDICRAFT TO CAPITALISM (Kautsky) 1½d.

COMMUNIST MANIFESTO ... 2½d.

WAGES AND CAPITAL (Marx) 1½d.

JONES ... 1½d.

SOCIALISM OF THE WORKER (Sorge) 1½d.

HOW I BECAME A SOCIALIST

(Morris) 1½d.

THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION (Kautsky) 7½d.

ALL POST FREE.

IMPORTANT.

A SOCIAL . . . GATHERING OF PARTY MEMBERS AND FRIENDS

WILL BE HOLDEN

On **GOOD FRIDAY**

IN THE HALL OF

The Communist Club,
CHARLOTTE STREET, W.

—:—:—:
GREAT PROGRAMME IN PREPARATION.

—:—:—:
SONGS, DANCES, etc.

—:—:—:
DOORS OPEN . . . 7.30 p.m.

VOL. II

OF

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

(Sept., 1905 to Aug., 1906.)

Well bound in cloth, gold lettered,

Post Free . . . 3s. 0d.

Orders accompanied by remittance, should be addressed, S.P.G.B., 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

Branch Secretaries and others

SHOULD NOTE THAT

JACOMB BROS.

Can do their printing as Cheaply and as well as anyone else.

JACOMB BROS., Printers,
STRATFORD, E.

Printed by Jacob Bros., 11, 2a, Wingfield Road, Stratford, E., for the Proprietors, The Socialist Party of Great Britain, and published at 28, Cursitor Street, London.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

HOLDS

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master-class, and the consequent enslavement of the working-class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working-class from the domination of the master-class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working-class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist-class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working-class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working-class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master-class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

NOW READY.

S.P.G.B. LIBRARY, No. 2.

From Handicraft to Capitalism,

Translated from the German of
KARL KAUTSKY.

The only translation in the English language of this important section of the famous "Das Erfurter Program."

POST FREE . . . 1½d.

S.P.G.B., 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

The Head Office of The Socialist Party of Great Britain is at 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

HEAD OFFICE:

28, CURSITOR STREET, LONDON, E.C.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—A. Jones, Secretary, 3, Mathew St., Latchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at S.P.G.B., Laburnam House, 134, High Street, Battersea, S.W. Club open every evening.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Executive Committee. Applications should be sent to the General Secretary.

EAST HAM.—W. Gifford, Sec., 31, Maryland Square, Stratford. Branch meets Mondays at 7.30 a.m. at 447, Katherine Rd., Forest Gate.

EDMONTON.—Sidney Aty, Sec., 60, Gilpin Grove, Edmonton. Branch meets Wednesdays 8.30.

FULHAM.—J. Humphries, Secretary, 309, North End Rd. Branch meets Feb. 15 and alternate Fridays at 8.30. at Ingram's Coffee Tavern, Fulham Cross.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Fri. at 8.30 at 79, Grove Rd., Holloway. Communications to the Sec.

PADDINGTON.—T. A. Wilson, Sec., 90, Mortimer Road, Kensal Rise, W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at Harley's Coffee Tavern (foot of Lock Bridge), Harrow Road.

PECKHAM.—W. Wren, Sec., 91, Evelina Rd., Nunhead, S.E. Branch meets every Wed. at 8.30.

ROMFORD DIVISION.—All communications to the Secretary, S.P.G.B. Club, 39, York Road, Ilford. Branch meets Mondays at 8 at Club.

TOOTING.—P. Dumenil, Secretary, 36, Byton Road, Tooting, S.W. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. at Gorrings Dining Rooms, Gorrings Park, Parade, Tooting Junction.

TOTTENHAM.—T. Lobb, Sec. Branch meets Mon. 8 at p.m., at Sunbeam Coffee Tavern, High Rd. at p.m., at Sunbeam Coffee Tavern, High Rd.

WATFORD.—T. Wilkins, Sec., 4, Marlborough Rd. Branch meets alternate Fridays at 8 p.m.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Mondays 7.30, followed at 8.30 by discussion, at 447, Katherine Road, Forest Gate.

WOOD GREEN.—J. Crump, Secretary, 7, Dunloe Avenue, Downhill Park Road, Tottenham, N. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Sundays at 3.30.

WOOLWICH & PLUMSTEAD.—A. E. Rance, Sec., 71a, Marmadon Rd., Plumstead. Branch meets on 2nd and 4th Wednesdays in month at 80, Conway Road, Plumstead.

INFORMATION

concerning the Party can be obtained of the following

BIRMINGHAM.—H. Oldknow, 227, St. Saviour's Road, Saltley.

BRADFORD (Yorks).—Ben Wilde, 78, Godwin St.

BURTON-ON-TRENT.—J. Blundell, 157, New St.

LIVERPOOL.—J. M. O. Sullivan, 4, Laburnam Grove, Litherland.

MANCHESTER.—J. Marsh, 119, Blantyre Street, Swinton, Nr. Manchester.

WHOLESALE AGENTS

FOR

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD.

HENDERSON, 16, Paternoster Row, E.C.
JOHN HEYWOOD, Ltd., Deansgate, Manchester.
W. H. SMITH & SON, Blackfriars St., Manchester.
JOHN MENZIES, Ltd., Rose St., Edinburgh.
J. NAYLOR & Co., 147 & 149, Gt. Junction Street, Leith.

RETAIL AGENTS.

JACQUES, 191, Old Street, E.C.
TUCKWELL, 160, Fonthill Road, Finsbury Park.
VESPERMAN, 251, Gray's Inn Road, W.C.
WREN, 91, Evelina Road, Nunhead, S.E.
ROOK, 9a, Cursitor Street, E.C.
GRANT, Ilford Hill, Ilford.
SIMPSON, 209, Leytonstone Road, Stratford, E.
BREWSTER, 153, Barking Rd., Canning Town.
WARNE, 1a, Queen's Square, Upton Park, E.
MENHINICK, 40, King William St., London B'dge.
FOX, 18a, New Kent Road, S.E.
BURKE, 35, Ford Street, Bow, E.
Miss DICKENSON, 96, Laureston St., Edinburgh.
E. WALLACE, 73, Fountainbridge, Edinburgh.
P. MACINNES, 3, West Nicholson St., Edinburgh.
SHELLEY BOOK AGENCY, Gloucester Street, Oxford.
H. RUBIN, 13, Cottenham St., Westgate Hill, Newcastle-on-Tyne.
E. G. SMITH, 126, Tunnel Road, Liverpool.
N. MELLINSKY, 34, Meanwood Rd., Leeds.
A. POLLOCK, 18, Richardson St., Halifax.
W. K. LIGGATT, 27, Stevenson St., Calton, Glasgow.
L. MACARTNEY, 181, Overgate, Dundee.
LEWIS, Wood Street, Walthamstow.
McPHEELY, 33, London Road, Glasgow.
LOGAN, 1, Macfurlane St., Gallowgate, Glasgow.
HIGGINS, 52, Argyle St., Anderston, Glasgow.
MARTIN, 308, Govan St., S.S. Glasgow.
HUNTER, 151, Main St., Gorbals, Glasgow.
McDONALD, 203, Castle St., Townhead, Glasgow.
NAYLOR, 1776, Gt. Junction St., Leith.
NAYLOR, 1a, Bowling Green St., Leith.



THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

No. 32. Vol. 3.]

LONDON, APRIL, 1907.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

MORE FABIAN NOTES

WITH SOME FABIAN NOTIONS.

The following letter from a gentleman who suggests that our regard for common honesty will move us to the desired point of publication has been passed to me. If he had appealed to our regard for an *uncommon* honesty it would have been more to the point. However, here is the communication:—

Dear Comrade,

I am a regular reader of the "Standard" (the monthly, not the daily), and in the current issue I see that one of the features of the March issue is to be an interesting letter on "Why Every Other Political Party is Hostile to the S.P.G.B."

In part the answer is supplied by some of the writings in the Party's official organ—your own paper. I admire unfettered thinking, and clear, incisive writing, but I wish to lodge a respectful protest against the column-and-a-half entitled "Fabian Notes" in the February issue. It embodies either a ridiculous misapprehension of a sentence used by Mr. H. Snell (and quoted), or a wilful distortion of his obvious meaning—for the purpose of discrediting the Fabians in general. Even if an individual member did entertain the ideas attributed to Snell, it is grossly unfair to brand the whole society on such evidence.

The quotation from Snell's speech was as follows: "The government of the future will be by experts and we, naturally, want to be the experts." In this sentence, "we" most certainly means *Socialists generally*, and not members of the Fabian Society in particular. Under the Socialist State (unless people should revert to a very simple life—which is unlikely), it is certain that experts *will* be needed—in manufacture, in the arts, and even in distribution. There will be no government in any sense approximating to the present class government. And during the transitional stage, which has now commenced (with the growth of trusts on the one hand, and of municipal enterprises on the other), it is equally certain that experts *are* needed; and it was to this aspect that Snell's remark had special reference, for if one thing seems specially obvious in this matter, it is that the workers—the real producers—will receive a nearer approximation to justice under a Socialist than under an individualist; but, just as obviously, the Socialist expert is likely to be passed over, if his principles are known and put into practice. The *implication* is, that the experts must be converted to Socialism, just as the workers must be; and in this direction the Fabian Society is doing sound work (although its work covers much ground in other directions also).

Whether, under Socialism, the expert would be paid at a higher rate than the "ordinary" worker, is a question which is really not raised by Mr. Snell. I would give my own answer to the question by asking another: Why should he be? That his abilities are of a less common kind than those of the men who work under his direction, supplies no ethical claim for special treatment. Generally speaking, the work of the expert (as of the artist) is agreeable: he is impelled to do it: and he will give his best how-

soever he be rewarded. I, and many who think like me, would have a high reward accorded to the scavenger rather than to the expert.

Your leading article, "The Quintessence of Socialism," gets to the root of the matter. Until all industries are socialised, and their control won by the workers, the nationalisation (or municipalisation) of isolated industries will be of little service. The best to be hoped of the latter is that conditions shall be *somewhat* superior to those in the corresponding privately-owned industries—and even that is too seldom attained. The moral is: Unite, for Socialism and Democracy; accept all palliatives offered, but be sparing of thanks, for the most that will be conceded falls far short of the just claims of the workers.

Nevertheless, to preach hatred of the bourgeoisie or the so-called "upper" classes or to foster misunderstandings or "bad feeling" between class and class is both impolitic and immoral. All classes include Socialists—genuine Socialists. So far as the well-to-do are concerned—the people who stand to gain nothing tangible from the victory of Socialism—I ask, why decry those who adhere to the cause "for righteousness sake," and for no other reason?

Yet another, and a practical reason for preaching class-consciousness rather than class-hatred, is the immense numbers of "hangers-on" of the wealthy—those who produce useless luxuries for the "upper" classes or who minister directly to their comfort. These, too, are underpaid and oppressed: and the serious part of it is that they are rapidly increasing (in consequence of the growing aggregation of wealth in capitalistic hands). Yet their apparent interest, in the immediate future at any rate, lies in perpetuating existing conditions. These also need to be converted—*must* be converted, if Socialism is to be won; for they are too numerous to be disregarded. At present they appear to be about the most impermeable classes of the whole community: they are unlikely to be moved by mere rancorous abuse of their "masters," but in the long run they *must* be amenable to reason. (As my letter has dealt largely with an attack on the Fabian Society, I may say—to anticipate a possible gibe—that I do not think the Society either tries or expects to make much impression on the classes in question—though ultimately, perhaps, the impression may be made through their masters).

Whilst preaching the Class War, then, it is imperative that the constructive and idealistic side of Socialism should also be emphasised. In the Socialist State, none (save the shirkers) will be worse off than at present—in all that really makes the happiness of existence: but it will uplift the toilers almost beyond their most daring visions.

I plead, therefore, for union and co-operation within the movement—with free but not ill-natured criticism of each other when differences arise.

Yours fraternally,
FABIAN FREE.

As the blushing author of the article referred to I beg to thank "Fabian Free" for his "free but not ill-natured criticism," the more so because with almost overwhelming magnanimity he gives me the choice of two labels. I am, it seems, either a liar or a fool—whichever I please. (As a lover of "clear, incisive writing" "Fabian Free" will appreciate the merit these easily understood terms possess over "ridiculous misapprehension" and "wilful distortion.") And that is very sweet and comradely in my good-natured critic. There *have* been gentle Fabians who have given me no such freedom of selection.

But notwithstanding this much appreciated concession for the sake of "union and co-operation within the movement," (which the gods forbid that I should attempt to disturb), I will venture a free and not ill-natured rejoinder in the hope that I may be successful in making my "grossly unfair" conduct appear a little less reprehensible. I hope "Fabian Free" will bear with me.

Now it seems that when Mr. Snell said "we naturally want to be the experts" who will govern in the future, he *most certainly* meant Socialists generally and not Fabians in particular. Did he? And how does "Fabian Free" know that? Will he be greatly surprised to learn that Mr. Snell "most certainly" meant nothing of the sort?

When Mr. Snell made the statement he was describing the special function of the Fabian Society as distinguished from all other Socialist and pseudo-Socialist parties whose origin and work he was at the moment outlining. If his words had any meaning at all they made it emphatically clear that Mr. Snell was of the opinion that the particular duty laid upon the Fabian Society on whose behalf he was speaking, was that of the training of the expert who was, he thought, to govern in the future.

This may, of course, be a wilful distortion or a ridiculous misapprehension of the function of, and grossly unfair to, the Fabian Society, but that is not my affair. "Fabian Free" had better take the matter up with his Executive Committee, who will then probably restrain their unhappy fugleman. But I think it more likely that "Fabian Free" will receive the shocking intimation that the Executive of his Party share Mr. Snell's view. In which case "Fabian Free" will perhaps apologise to Mr. Snell and withdraw from the Fabian Society—and perhaps not. However that may be, I trust he will not trouble to apologise to me. I don't matter. Besides, I'm used to being called names—especially by good-natured comrades of other parties. It's their little way of ensuring union and co-operation in the movement.

For the rest, "Fabian Free" does not appear to have profited by his regular reading of this paper, and therefore fails to realise that "clear and incisive" style which is *his* admiration and our normal method. His meaning is often, if he will allow me to say so, obscure, and is not made more apparent by repeated use of the word "obviously" or its equivalent. It is a little—may I say—ludicrous, to keep on making the

strenuous assertion that obviously it is so-and-so when obviously it isn't. It is like crying peace when there is no peace. But I will try my prentice hand at digging his argument out.

Let us assume Mr. Snell meant what "Fabian Free" says he meant. So. "The government of the future" applies only to the transition stage. It is for this stage that the Socialist expert is required. Yet in this stage "Fabian Free" agrees the working class can be little if anything better off. Why? Because while capitalism holds the causes of poverty and working-class unhappiness remain. Therefore your Socialist expert under capitalist conditions, because he can do no more than administer capitalist laws, is of no more use than a non-Socialist expert. And as under Socialism "there will be no government in any sense approximating to the present," the Socialist governmental expert of the transition period will then find himself without visible means of subsistence!

It seems to a plain person like myself a dreadful waste of effort to labour in the conversion and training of Socialist governmental experts who are useless to day and for ever. They had far better take my advice and apply themselves to the acquisition of some useful trade.

And I cannot allow "Fabian Free" for one purpose to limit Mr. Snell's statement to a certain machinery in a certain stage and for another to apply it in a broader sense to a different stage. I am quite ready to have at him with a free and not ill-natured criticism on any question of working-class interest he likes to raise, but he must keep to his premise or definitely relinquish it. If Mr. Snell's statement referred, as I believe it did, to government under Socialism,—that at any rate was the impression left not with myself alone, by Mr. Snell's clear and incisive oratory,—"Fabian Free" may deal with my article from that standpoint, and I will deal with him—very happy for the chance, I'm sure. (And then perhaps I shall be able to get him to explain what the Dickens he means by his Socialist expert under Socialism being overlooked because his principles were known.) If the statement referred to the ante-Socialist period, as "Fabian Free" asserts, then the question of the remuneration of the governmental bureaucrat does not arise. The industrial expert under Socialism is a different person from the governmental expert. The first, adequately defined, may be allowed. The second is the person we are talking about. If "Fabian Free" desires to drub me on him, let him waste in. I've still got an old pencil stump and a piece of paper left to me by the friendly broker's man.

"Fabian Free's" sixth par. is, I admit, a fair contribution to incisive writing and displays at once the unfortunate misapprehensions existing in the writer's mind. To talk of hatred of the bourgeoisie being impolitic and immoral is piffle. The hatred is simply an expression, a natural and inevitable expression, of detestation of what "Fabian Free" admits is a wrong, viz., the subjugation and robbery of one class by another. To point this out and emphasize its purport is not immoral—if there be any meaning left in that ill-used word. Nor is it impolitic—unless "Fabian Free" desires to suggest that it is unwise to tell the truth. True all (read both) classes may, *prima facie*, include Socialists, but members of the capitalist class are only Socialists to the extent that they vacate their class position and go over to the working class.

I will argue this point at greater length if "Fabian Free" wishes it, later, and will only say here that the number of people who are Socialists "for righteousness sake," large though it appears to "Fabian Free," will dwindle almost to a vanishing point under scrutiny, and come out from the ordeal mainly as a congregation of individuals who have decided that anyhow, to use "Fabian Free's" own words, they will not be worse off under Socialism, but might be considerably better. Holding as we do that material interests are, in the final analysis, at the root of all human actions, we can quite understand the existence of men in the ranks of the bourgeoisie who can see the advantages of Socialism, and are prepared to fight their own class in order to realise it. Their help is not rejected, but it is not necessarily of more consequence than the help of a similar number of the working class. On the other hand, how-

ever, it must not be forgotten that men of the capitalist class have come out ostensibly to help but actually to wreck, if possible, the working-class movement. Therefore, recruits from that quarter should be dealt with circumspectly.

The important point to be remembered in this connection is, that the Socialist movement is absolutely and entirely a working-class movement. It expresses the struggle of the working class against the exploiting capitalist class, and must finally result in the triumph of the workers and the extermination of the capitalists.

Nor can we gild the Socialistic pill for the benefit of the flunkey class. Their material interests will probably keep them bound to their masters until pressure of economic forces, already perceptibly operating, compels them to see that their sole hope also lies in Socialism. They will have to swallow the pill willy-nilly. And if they then discover, as they will, that there is nothing nauseating in the operation, so much the better.

For our part we will tell them the truth (when we can get at 'em) as straight and clear as we tell it to any other section of the people. That is our business—the only reason for our existence. And not even for "Fabian Free," much though we should value his union and co-operation, will we depart from our habit of calling a spade a spade, or a labour misleader a fraud, or a Fabian a bureaucrat, or an I.L.P.-cum-L.R.C'er a man on the bounce, or an S.D.F. palliative-monger a confusionist.

And that, gentle "Fabian Free," if you particularly want to know, is in brief the reason why every other party is opposed to the S.P.G.B. and the S.P.G.B. is opposed to every other party.

A. JAMES.

CORRESPONDENCE.

[To the Editor of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD.]

THE LATE DISPUTE IN ISLINGTON.

Sir,—Re your article in the February Socialist STANDARD: "The Late Islington Dispute," wherein you make a statement that no delegate had instructions to vote "Islington's expulsion," which is not true, as I was present at the Tottenham Branch meeting, when the delegates got instructions to vote for the expulsion of Islington.

W. INNES.

[Though it was evident that Mr. Innes was entirely in error, it was decided, in order that not the slightest doubt might remain, to request the secretary of the Tottenham Branch to forward a copy of all minutes containing instructions to delegates to the quarterly delegate meeting in question. These Comrade Lobb has sent and they make it abundantly clear that there is no truth in Mr. Innes' allegation. The following is a copy of the Tottenham secretary's letter:

Dear Comrade,—Re yours of Feb. 24th. The following is a copy of minutes from the minute book of the Tottenham Branch, dated respectively the 9th and 23rd of July, 1906:—

July 9th.—"H. A. Young and E. Stevens were appointed delegates to Quarterly Delegate Meeting." July 23rd.—"Secretary read re Bexley Heath and Islington Branches. After considerable discussion, Kauter proposed and Dye seconded, 'That delegates defend the action of the E.C. and condemn the action of the Islington Branch.' Resolution carried. Young and Stevens being unable to attend, Rich and Stowe were appointed, and credentials handed to Stowe."

The subject under discussion was the stopping of propaganda meetings of the Islington Branch and the instructions given were to condemn same and support the action of the E.C. re Bexley Branch.

Yours fraternally,
J. W. LOBB.

As was stated in the February issue of this journal, "no delegate of any branch had instructions to vote Islington's expulsion." The minutes in question are open to the inspection of Mr. Innes upon application.]

Order THE SOCIALIST STANDARD through your local newsagent. If you have any difficulty in obtaining it regularly please communicate with the S.P.G.B., 28, Cursitor St., London, E.C.

IS THE S.P.G.B. THE PARTY OF THE WORKERS?

[Report of a debate between J. FITZGERALD, S.P.G.B. (affirmative) and E. J. B. ALLEN, S.L.P. (negative) at the Engineers' Institute, Plumstead, January 20th, 1907.]

FITZGERALD, in opening, said that to decide which was the workers' Party it was necessary to describe the worker's position. To-day he was an article of merchandise, for he had no access to the means of existence save by selling his energy on the labour market. The means of existence and the wealth produced were owned and controlled by the capitalist class, and this economic cleavage between the two classes resulted in an antagonism of interests. The ruling class were numerically small; how then were they able to retain control over the means of existence and the lives of the workers? When the workers showed signs of revolt, police, judicial, military and naval forces were brought against them. But these forces could not exist on air. The supplies necessary to keep and arm these forces are provided for out of revenue and voted for in parliaments. Thus the control of the political machinery enables the capitalist class to retain their position. The Party of the workers must therefore have for its object the control of the means of existence and the capture of political power as chief means to this end.

The ruling class keep employed a specially trained section for this political work and trickery, but the workers have not the wealth, leisure, or opportunity to acquire the same proficiency in trickery (even if it were defensible). Consequently the only method remaining to the workers is an open and above-board organisation for the capture of political power.

Fitzgerald then proceeded to examine various political parties such as the Liberal, Tory, and Labour parties and the I.L.P. and S.D.F. from the above basis, and showed how hopeless they were from the point of view of working-class emancipation. He then dealt with the S.L.P., which, while claiming to accept the position already laid down, denied this practically by forming their organisation in an underhand way. This organisation, like the S.P.G.B., grew out of the so-called "Impossibilist" movement in the S.D.F. The movement manifested itself at the West Ham and Birmingham conferences of the S.D.F., and at Blackburn the London and Scottish sections agreed to work together. The London section abided by this, but just before the next conference news came that instead of working for the alteration of the policy of the S.D.F., the Scottish section had been secretly organising a new party. The London section, recognising that the workers must consciously work out their own emancipation, refused to blindly follow either superior persons from Queen Anne's Gate or self-styled geniuses from Scotland, and continuing their work converted so many that after the Burnley conference the S.P.G.B. was formed in an open and straightforward manner. The S.L.P. had a palliative programme when first formed, while the S.P.G.B. ignored these confusing items. The S.L.P. merely adopted parrot-like the actions and phrases of the American S.L.P. without considering whether they were applicable to conditions here.

E. J. B. ALLEN in reply said that he had attended the meeting of the London "Impossibilists" after the Shoreditch conference, and Fitzgerald had said nothing about having been deceived, but only that he was not going to help form a party with two dozen. Fitzgerald had said that the workers must get control of the political machinery, but had not shown how this was to be done. Marx had shown that it was those who had economic power that controlled in Society, the political and other factors being based on the economic. Engels had pointed out that with the establishment of Socialism politics would be abolished. The workers must have an economic organisation to enforce their expressions on the political field. A political movement without force behind it was a farce. How were they going to get the economic organisation of the working class which would be a real power? One way was to convert the existing class-unconscious organisa-

tions. The other way was to build up a class-conscious organisation themselves.

With regard to the S.L.P. in England adopting methods from America, why did not the S.P.G.B. produce an economic system of its own instead of taking that of Marx? In America the Socialist Trade and Labour Alliance had failed, while in the West there grew up the American Labour Union. This and other organisations met in Chicago in 1905 and formed the "Industrial Workers of the World." This was the union they were endeavouring to establish here. In it the workers would be organised to take and hold the means of existence against the capitalist class. It would furnish the might necessary to enforce the political right, and was therefore the most important. How was the S.P.G.B. going to make the trade unions take up the Socialist position? The S.L.P. intended to form an I.W.W. as soon as they had the strength. They admitted members of various political parties into the Advocates of Industrial Unionism.

He challenged Fitzgerald to show where the S.L.P. had violated the Unity Programme as printed in THE SOCIALIST STANDARD. While preaching the principles of unity the S.P.G.B. denied them for the purpose of keeping their little Party alive. With reference to the straight and above-board position of the S.P.G.B., he had read two pamphlets issued by the Islington Branch, and so far as he could see they had made out their case against the E.C. of the S.P.G.B.

FITZGERALD then said that he had insisted so much on the swindling of the Scotsmen at the "Impossibilist" meeting that one present had tried to minimise Yates' admission that the Scotsmen had been building up a new party during two years.

The workers' greatest difficulty would not be to get a parliamentary majority but to get control of the positions of the permanent officials. Regarding Engels' statement that the political state would die out, Engels had defined the political state as the expression of the ruling class; but so important did he consider the capture of political power that he italicised the sentence "The Proletariat seizes political power and turns the means of production into state property."

The political machinery was the means whereby the businesses and collective needs of Society were co-ordinated, and which would under Socialism become their co-ordination for the benefit of all. The economic organisation could not take and hold the factories, etc. while the capitalist class controlled the armed forces, for by these the workers could easily be dispossessed.

They accepted any scientific truth or discovery, whether it originated in America or Germany, but a thing was not necessarily correct because it was adopted in America, while we should probably learn as much from the mistakes of other countries as from their truths. From the time of the formation of the S.T. & L.A. right up to 1904 the position of the S.L.P. was that the political arm must dominate the economic; but with the formation of the I.W.W. a complete change occurred, for it is now said that the economic arm must dominate the political. If this were true why form a political organisation at all? If economic organisation furnishes the might and the method why do not the advocates of I.W.W.-ism proclaim themselves the Anarchists they are and give all their attention to the economic organisation? We could not make the trade unions do anything; we could only educate them until sufficient had been converted to make possible the action we desired. The S.L.P. had violated THE SOCIALIST STANDARD unity programme by their violation of the principle that the workers must consciously emancipate themselves at the very formation of their Party. With reference to the two Islington pamphlets, he had challenged and was prepared to meet Lehané.

ALLEN then said regarding the economic organisation "taking and holding," the Government were once unable to hold the naval manœuvres because the South Wales miners were on strike. Under the industrial form of organisation the workers could prevent the transport of troops. If the workers refused to make the weapons, etc., there would be none for the soldiers to use

against the workers. Fitzgerald's definition of the political machinery under Socialism was merely the federal council to supervise the economic departments. While he himself and all other Socialists that he knew had been educated from the political side, Allen considered it easier to teach the mass through the economic organisation. They were not Anarchists because the Anarchists denied the need for organisation. The occurrences at Portsmouth showed the shaky position of the capitalist class regarding the armed forces.

The workers had often to migrate for purposes of their employment, and this disfranchised a large number; he was therefore not sure the workers had a voting majority. Fitzgerald had asked how a man could claim to accept the revolutionary position and yet remain in the I.L.P., but Fitzgerald was not born a member of the S.P.G.B., he had to develop. They of the S.L.P. had never said "We alone are the holy ones. No one can be a Socialist who does not join us." The difference between the S.L.P. and the S.P. was a difference between theorists and men prepared to join hands with the working class and get them to take united action. No matter what organisation a man belonged to, if he accepted the revolutionary position as laid down by the A.I.U. he was welcomed.

FITZGERALD in his last speech said, as to the workers refusing to supply the soldiers with arms and ammunition, that town could give a significant answer. In Woolwich Arsenal seven years' war stores were supposed to be kept, and visitors could see that great stocks were there. Against these years of supply the workers had only empty pockets and empty cupboards. In Italy the places of striking railway men were taken by armed soldiers, by whom such transport as was essential was carried on. He denied that it was easier to teach the workers from the economic side, for there the petty interests arising from the daily struggle hinder the recognition of the class position. We stood upon the correct basis of continuing the education of the workers inside and outside their unions so that the Socialist political and economic organisations may be built up that will accomplish their emancipation.

ALLEN in his closing speech said the railway strike in Italy was not a general strike, nor were the men revolutionists, so that what happened there did not disprove his case. If, as Fitzgerald maintained, the capitalists controlled all these stores, how were you going to vote them out? The statement that the political organisation was not concerned with the petty details of the workers' affairs showed the error of the position of the S.P.G.B. Such a party degenerated into a side show of word spinners and logic choppers and will inevitably be split into fragments as it was now doing. All the world over Industrial Unionism was growing with Socialism. You must have economic unity before political unity. He knew it was a longer road to organise the workers economically for their emancipation, but they were prepared to face the difficulties and were going on with the work.

The Chairman, H. Stiff (S.P.G.B.), said in closing the meeting it was the first time that revolutionary Socialism had been preached in that hall.

There was a good attendance and the literature of both parties was on sale.

At Christmas time Capital gathered his happy family around him and in the presence of the ladies in the neighbourhood gave him a short oration. "Me brave la-ads," said he, "we've had a good year (cheers). I have made a million dollars (sensation). I attribute this to me supererogatory skill, aided by ye'r arnest efforts at th' bench an' at th' forge (sobs). Ye have done so well that we won't need so many iv ye as we did (long and continuous cheerin'). Those iv us who can do two men's wurruk will remain, an' if possible do four. Our other faithful servants" he says "can come back in th' spring" he says "if alive" he says. An' th' bold artisans tossed their paper caps in th' air an' give three cheers fr Capital.

They wurruked till o' age crept on thim, an' thim retired to live on th' wish-bones an' kind wurruks they had accumulated.

Mr. DOOLEY in "Capital and Labour."

THE ADVANCE OF MACHINERY.

THERE have been installed at the Sholmal malt-millings of Messrs. Samuel Allsopp & Sons two machines that are calculated to ultimately effect a saving of labour to the extent of 50 per cent. The machines, for which patents have been obtained, are the result of several experiments on the part of Mr. F. Griffiths, maltster at the works mentioned. The appliances are known as "the Burton automatic grain sacking apparatus" and "the Burton grain bulking machine." The former has been working for some little time, but the latter has only just been perfected.

Formerly the unloading of grain from railway waggons and bulking it into heaps six feet deep has been entirely performed by manual labour, at a cost of between 6s. to 8s. per 100 qrs., and the total cost of removing 150 qrs. per day has been about 13s. 4d. This appliance, however, can put barley in bulk to a height of six feet at the rate of 400 qrs. per day from any distance in the granary, with the aid of the necessary number of boys, at a cost of 1s. 4d. per day per boy. Where grain requires moving from one part of the warehouse to another the sack-filling machine can be employed to lift it into sacks or tip barrows, and the bulking machine deposits it where it may be required. The method generally in use for putting grain into heaps on the arrival of a large consignment (though in some cases maltsters use their own particular system) is by means of men carrying the material in sacks, running up a plank and pitching it over. But in this way a lot of labour is entailed, and the work is arduous, seeing that each sack contains 16 stone weight.

The method of the new apparatus is simple. The contents of the sacks are shot into a receiver, and the grain being conveyed up an elevator in cups, is finally distributed where required from a shoot. In regard to the automatic sacking apparatus, the saving effected is placed at between 50 and 60 per cent. In the majority of granaries most of the grain is bushelled or otherwise lifted by hand into sacks. The machine under notice entirely obviates this, and is capable of "sacking up" from 500 to 650 quarters per day of nine hours, with the help of three boys. It is entirely automatic in its movement into the grain, and can be driven off any existing shafting by either a special rope drive or by a motor of any description fitted to the machine, thus making it entirely independent. This is an ingenious contrivance. It is placed at the side of a heap of grain, and in the front part there is a worm which works the grain to the centre. As in the other machine, the barley is then taken up over the elevator in cups on an endless belt, and thrown into the hopper, from which it passes through the slide and into sacks at the back in charge of lads.

The most intricate and vital part of the machine is, perhaps, the eccentric and ratchet arrangement, which pushes the machine forward into the grain. This part, when one bag is full, is automatically thrown out of gear by the contact of two buffers at the front with the grain. The lad then puts down the slide and stops the grain while he takes the full bag away and opens the slide at the mouth of the other bag. With this machine only one strong boy need be in attendance, to hang on sacks for filling. The cost depends somewhat on the distance the sacks have to be taken for loading into railway trucks. The total cost per day for filling 500 qrs. into sacks and loading them into railway trucks has been 15s. 8d., against 9s. or 10s. and upwards for every 100 qrs. by hand labour. The machines are in daily use at Messrs. Samuel Allsopp's maltmills, and it is claimed that they will in all probability revolutionise the method of dealing with grain at maltmills in the course of time.

Burton Evening Gazette.

A LESSON ON "VALUE."

For the loss of a dog in a railway accident on the Midland, the owner has been awarded £300 damages. For the loss of her husband, an engine driver, also in a railway accident, a Mrs. Robbins has just been awarded £100. Don't get married, ladies—take out a dog licence.

As we have so often pointed out, the displacement of men by women and even by children is incidental to the capitalist system and must and does take place in offices as well as in mills and factories. The writers of some of the letters that have appeared in the Press concerning this particular case have made some extraordinary suggestions and have mostly shown a lamentable ignorance of things as they are. They have appealed to the "feelings" of the Directors, etc. In days gone by, when businesses were small, when they were personally superintended by the proprietors, there no doubt did exist some feeling of friendship between the employer and his employees, but since the advent of the large concerns, the joint stock corporations, where often the employees never see the actual proprietors, where the departmental managers are expected to make their respective departments "pay," sentiment is entirely out of the question. Business is not carried on for philanthropy but for dividends.

* * *

It has also been suggested that the lesson to be learnt by the clerk is that there is still room for him if he will make himself an all round competent man. But there are plenty of these to-day working for a mere pittance, and plenty even dossing nightly at Booth's hotels. Moreover, the only practical school for acquiring efficiency in office routine is the office itself, and the conditions of modern offices render it impossible for the necessary experience to be obtained. The "From Powder Monkey to Admiral," "Office Boy to Proprietor" fiction is long since exploded. In the small office, say with manager, cashier, clerk, junior and office boy, the "yob" certainly did have an opportunity, provided he were smart, of acquiring a general and particular knowledge of the office routine and of the business transacted, but as the small offices gave place to the mammoth concerns now so common in commercial centres, the work became departmentalised and all-round knowledge rendered unnecessary for the majority of the staff. The newcomer, however proficient he may have made himself at commercial schools and similar institutions for extracting fees out of would-be Pierpoint Morgans, finds himself set to work which, as Mr. Stewart says, is "merely a matter of figures." Usually, his only hope of promotion is to become the head of the department, or one of that worthy's "coppers," but between him and the coveted post intervenes an array of a score or more all anxious for advancement and all as little likely to secure it. His knowledge is useless because his only prospect is to remain at one particular job, at work which could be done by any other fairly correct person, male or female.

* * *

What the clerk has to do is to drop his cant of respectability and to recognise that economic development, which has reduced the skilled mechanic to a casual labourer, has also affected him. The growth of large concerns, the aggregation of capital, the increased use of mechanical appliances, in offices as elsewhere, the subdivision and departmentalisation now generally in vogue, have effected vast changes in the status of the wage and salary earner, of those who have to sell their abilities, physical or mental, to the master class. Under capitalism, production per head of the population tends to increase continually, but production per head of the actually employed workers also increases. Thus the army of the unemployed will be an ever-growing one and we ask our opponents to show how the problem can be dealt with apart from a re-organisation of industry—apart from the substitution of Socialism for the present system.

J. KAY.

VOL. II

OF

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

(Sept., 1905 to Aug., 1906.)

Well bound in cloth, gold lettered,

Post Free ... 3s. 0d.

Orders, accompanied by remittance, should be addressed: S.P.G.B., 28, Cursthorpe Street, London, E.C.

HERBERT SPENCER AND SOCIALISM.

Reprinted from the Burton Evening Gazette.

Sir,—In a recent issue of your paper there appeared a report of a lecture on "Herbert Spencer," which was delivered by Mr. F. E. Lott, F.I.C., A.R.S.M. Being an ardent admirer of Mr. Spencer and his "Synthetic Philosophy," as well as an enthusiastic Socialist, I may be permitted to crave your indulgence for the following remarks regarding your report.

The passage which engaged my attention is the following:—

"His principles of sociology showed that he was no believer in Socialism, though he had often been hailed as such. The principle of ethics was, perhaps, the most important part of his works, and in it he demonstrated that Socialism attempted to improve social life by breaking the fundamental law of social life."

I presume that the fundamental law of social life referred to is the principle of every man being entitled to the fullest liberty so long as the like liberty of others is not infringed. With this principle as thus expressed in abstract terms I think few Socialists would disagree. The difficulty arises when we discuss what constitutes an infringement of the liberty of others. Spencer held that the State was an organism. But in applying his principles to man in his relation to the State he treated Society not as an organism but as an aggregation of individual units.

Another quotation may be allowed me from a letter from Spencer to John Stuart Mill—

"The view for which I contend is, that morality properly so called—the science of right conduct—has for its object to determine how or why certain modes of conduct are detrimental and certain other modes beneficial. These good and bad results cannot be accidental, but must be necessary consequences of the constitution of things, and I conceive it to be the business of moral science to deduce from the laws of life and the conditions of existence what kinds of action necessarily tend to produce happiness, and what kinds to produce unhappiness. Having done this, its deductions are to be recognised as laws of conduct, and are to be conformed to, irrespective of a direct estimation of happiness or misery."

Now, how can Socialism be viewed as infringing those principles? The Socialist looks upon Society as an organism of which human beings form the cells. Any disease of the cells of an organism is injurious to the organism. Anything depriving the cellular tissue of its proper nutrition causes a disease of the tissue, and the organism suffers. The Socialist viewing the present society, based upon the class ownership of wealth and the means of wealth production, sees that many millions of the human cells forming that society are deprived of the means of proper sustenance, whilst others of those human cells are fed to repletion. As one organ of the human organism may be a parasite seeking aggrandisement at the expense of the other organs, so in the body social we have a class of machine-owners living as parasites upon the labour of machine-minders.

View human society as it has been pictured by Mr. Charles Booth in his investigations into London poverty, by Mr. S. Rowntree in York, others at Egremont and elsewhere, as well as the conditions mentioned in the Interdepartmental Report on Physical Deterioration, and the more recent report on the condition of the working-class in Dundee. From these reports it is evident that at least 13,000,000 people in this country are living below the line of bare physical efficiency. And why? Because Society to-day is organised in the interests of a class. That this is the inevitable result of a long process of evolution makes it none the better for the working class, though this knowledge affords a hope that the end of the evolutionary process is not yet.

The reason is that the worker to-day can live only by selling his labour power—his power of working—for such a remuneration as barely suffices to replace the energy expended on his work, together with rearing, in the cheapest possible manner, a family of future workers to replace him when he gets "too old at forty." In return for this wage—this food, clothing, and

shelter—the worker toils for a longer period than is necessary to replace its value. The surplus he creates in this surplus time forms a product which is divided into various parts. These parts are the profit, the rent, and the interest of the ruling class.

The Socialist, therefore, contends that profit, rent, and interest are merely the various shapes which is taken by the unpaid labour of the worker. He further contends that every new improvement of machinery, each wage-saving contrivance, which speeds up the working-power of the individual worker, increases the wealth of the capitalist, while it further degrades the worker. The division between extreme wealth and extreme poverty has never been so great as it is to-day. Though the economic position of the worker is declining relatively to his powers over nature, his potential power of altering the structure of Society is ever increasing. The manufacturer, the merchant, producing in order that his capital may fructify, has to compete in the market with other men of similar aim. Each manufacturer seeks to augment his share of the market. In prosperous times, like the present, he works his machines at full pressure to meet the demands of the market. Unwittingly his efforts, his rivals do likewise, and the market becomes glutted. Men are thrown out of work, thus reducing the "effective demand" for commodities. Amidst the plethora of wealth poverty increases. Under capitalism, says Charles Fourier, "poverty is born of superabundance."

The capitalist, finding his warehouse glutted with merchandise, oftentimes perishable, and his machines idle, finds it difficult to meet his bills. The necessity of paying his creditors, of redeeming his bills of exchange, makes it imperative to sell at a loss. During such a period of commercial stress bankruptcies are many. On the other hand, those manufacturers with a larger capital who are better able to face those times find in them their most glorious harvest, and buy up their smaller rivals.

Thus the tendency of modern competition is towards the concentration of capital in fewer hands, and the growth of gigantic businesses. Competition must necessarily evolve monopoly.

We see, then, that the evolution of modern industrial forms is towards the trust. No human effort can head back this movement. Under Free Trade or Protection, under Monarchy or Republic, the trust alike flourishes. To-day, then, it is evident that the evolution of industrial forces and of methods of production, upon which the social superstructure is erected, is in the direction of sameness of life, sameness of outlook, monotony in dwelling, monotony in work, monotony in every phase of our mental, physical and moral life, under which man must sell his labour as a merchandise, under which he is virtually a slave to a wage system.

Against this the Socialist makes a vigorous protest. The Socialist is an individual who wishes to introduce a system of society under which the highest individuality of every man could be developed. He claims, however, that in the necessary toil of Society in providing the means of satisfying human needs every healthy man and woman should bear their share. With the present power of man and the machinery at his disposal two hours work a day on the part of every adult member of the community, excluding the aged and the infirm, would more than meet the necessary demands of Society, and beyond that Society would not seek to restrict his efforts in any way.

Surely this would not constitute so great an interference with man's individuality as does the social conditions of to-day with its overwork on insufficient wage. Socialism would be a system of Society in which the needs of the individual would be no longer antagonistic to, but harmonious with, the needs of Society. It would be a condition not of Man v. Society, but of Man and Society with identical interests. In such a society only would it be possible to properly "deduce from the laws of life and the conditions of existence what kinds of action necessarily tend to produce happiness and what kinds to produce unhappiness."

To prepare for the establishment of such a society is the object of The Socialist Party of Great Britain, which recognises the need of propagating these principles, and building up a political organisation which will capture the

forms of Government for the express purpose of taking command of the trusts and of the means of producing and distributing wealth. We are seeking to get rid, once and for all, of individual ownership of social forces, to the end that man's individuality, health, comfort, and welfare may be secured.

I am, sir,
Your obedient servant,
"ECONOMICS."

APOSTLES OF CONFUSION.

THE last strains of the "Marseillaise" (it's all right, Mr. Editor, this is not a tale of the French Revolution)—the last strains of the "Marseillaise" were being sung when two comrades of the Watford Branch and myself entered Clarendon Hall, Watford, on the evening of Friday, February 22nd. We found an audience of about 300 assembled to hear addresses by Hyndman and Gribble (of Northampton) on Social-Democracy. The meeting was being held under the auspices of the Watford S.D.F., I.L.P., Trades Council, and Labour Church.

To make speeches that would suit such a mixture of pseudo-Socialists, "Labour" men and reformers as were here gathered together would tax the capabilities of the best S.D.F. speaker, and that is saying much. Anyway, Hyndman and Gribble tried, and whether they succeeded in tickling the ears of their audience or not, they certainly never gave a clear exposition of Socialist principles. At least, that was our opinion, but then perhaps we are "too scientific." As we took our seats, the chairman, Mr. Gorie, who proclaimed himself the only working-class representative on the local bodies, was reading apologies for non-attendance from Lord Hyde and other class-conscious individuals.

The chairman then made a short speech intimating that an S.D.F. candidate would be run for the County Council. Gribble was called upon and proceeded to speak on "Social-Democracy and the Present Political Situation." After a few preliminary remarks (including the usual compliments to Hyndman) he assured us "that it was never more necessary than it was to-day for Socialists to work along the straight path," a remark that called forth loud "hear, hears" from the S.P.G.B. men.

He then traced the evolution of the Socialist movement in England. He stated how the S.D.F. had fought alone for many years; told us how the I.L.P. came into existence as an independent political party only, but gradually evolved until it differed but slightly in its principles from the S.D.F. He told us of the desire for fusion that grew up in the two parties, of the vote taken and carried by a large majority, but did not tell us why the leaders refused to carry out the mandate of the members.

Briefly scanning the events that led to the formation of the L.R.C., he tried to make clear the S.D.F. position in regard to that body. He said "it was a policy of friendly criticism and advice." We (the S.P.G.B.) know where that policy has led.

He then told us how disappointed he was at the past year's work of the Labour Party, and proceeded to criticise its members. He dwelt with bitterness upon those "Socialists" who opposed the adoption of a Socialist programme. The speaker complained of the way the decisions of the Labour Conference had been set aside by the Executive body, and of the way in which, after Quelch and others had by superhuman efforts managed to make the trades unionists swallow an "Universal Suffrage" resolution, the Labour members had disregarded that vote, and had allowed individual members a free hand to support or oppose any measure they liked during the coming session.

"They," he said, "think that they alone are the Labour Party, and that the thousands behind them in the country are a mere nothing," and he grew sarcastic about Shackleton's withdrawal of the Old Age Pension amendment upon Mr. Asquith pointing out that it was a censure upon the Government. Then finishing up with the statement that the workers should put their trust in Socialists and disregard everything except the establishment of a Socialist Republic, Gribble sat down.

All this was very interesting. It might have been news to the audience, but it was merely what we had predicted come to pass.

Is Gribble's feeling toward the Labour Party the feeling of the S.D.F.? Did his remarks please or offend the members of the local branch?

As regards the S.D.F. as a body, we know that they occasionally utter a few criticisms of the Labour Party but all the time are supporting it. As regards the local branch, it is their duty either to repudiate Gribble or to repudiate and oppose the local Trades Council, I.L.P., and Labour Church.

But we know they will not do either. They will play the old game of being "all things to all men," and nothing of any real value to the working-class movement.

The chairman then introduced the principal speaker of the evening, Mr. H. M. Hyndman, who started his speech by saying, as he usually does, that he never worked but lived upon those who did. We had heard this before, but the audience had not, and cheered in the usual way. It always fetches 'em.

The speaker then went on to show the desirability of certain reforms, dealing at length with the question of Free Maintenance. "After years of agitation," he said, "we have at last got in the thin end of the wedge." Afterwards in answer to a question, he admitted that this much desired reform would only produce better wage-slaves for the capitalist. He enlarged upon the benefit of Better Housing and Old Age Pensions. In stating that the opposition to Socialism arose largely from ignorance, he said that he had sufficient faith in humanity to believe that, did but the governing classes only know what benefits would accrue from Socialism, notwithstanding their desire to dominate others, they would join the Socialist movement!

And so his speech proceeded, "boxing the compass" politically, industrially and ethically, hinting vaguely at revolution, dealing in detail with useless reforms, but never giving his audience any real insight into scientific Socialism.

After the collection, questions were called for. Comrade Wilkins asked the speaker how he reconciled his statement that the capitalist class would welcome Socialism when they saw what benefits would come, with his supposed belief in the Class Struggle and the Materialist Conception of History as expounded by Karl Marx.

Mr. Hyndman answered that no reconciling of statements was needed, that although he believed in the Class Struggle, he believed that when the capitalists recognised the advantages of Socialism they would welcome it. Yet previously in his speech he had quoted Marx in agreement with his contention that, however much peaceful revolutions are expected, history always proves the expectations false; that force is the deciding factor.

We sent up two other questions. One: was he in favour of economic organisation of the workers on a class basis, and if so could the present trade unions be altered to such? To this he replied that the outlook in the trade unions from a Socialist standpoint was hopeful, and seeing that many of their officials were S.D.F. men the future should see a more Socialist position taken up. The other question was: The Watford S.D.F. claimed to be revolutionary Socialists: if they believed what Gribble said to be true, would not the proper attitude to be taken up towards the Labour Party, both locally and nationally, be one of hostility?

But he would not have it. He could see the red light. "He wanted no rift within the lute" in Watford. So he said it was not his business. He left it to the local branch. He had never been a "Labour" man.

Of course it was not his business. Had he supported Gribble against the "Labour" crowd what a position the comrades would be in with an election coming on! It would not have paid. "We are willing," he said, "to work with those who go a little way with us and thus try and bring them in touch with Socialism." And this was what Hyndman has spent twenty-five years of his life for.

Afterwards, when I had bidden my friends "good-night," and braced myself for my four-mile walk home along the moonlit country lanes,

the pity of it all came to me.

With machinery and industrial organisation rendering larger masses of men superfluous; with the intensity of production lowering man's vitality; with the position of the workers becoming more precarious and the struggle for existence becoming keener; with all the degeneration, poverty and hunger, with all the horror there is no other word of capitalism, yet they have no other message for the workers than this.

For two whole hours, having before them three or four hundred men, probably open to receive the truth, they had told them half truths that are worse than lies. Men who, properly guided, might have become members of a sound Socialist party, were deliberately led into the disappointing wilderness of reform.

What can one think of it? Does Hyndman know the futility of these reforms he advocates? Does he know he is misleading the workers? Has he not learnt the lesson that years of struggling for these things with no avail should have taught? Can he not see that even if they were of any use the very best way to get them would be by the revolutionary method? Does he not perceive that by side-tracking the working-class movement in this way he is delaying the day of the wage-slaves' emancipation?

If he does not see, then he is a blind leader of the blind, and should not be listened to. If he does see, then he is wilfully misdirecting the precious energy of the workers and should be exposed. Whichever way it is, we of the S.P.G.B. know our duty and are prepared to do it. We may be dogmatic—so is Science. We may deal with persons sometimes: but the act of any man that rivets the chains tighter upon the limbs of the workers is too tragic in its consequences to be lightly passed over. We may be small in numbers, yet we know that our efforts are exposing the misleaders of the working class and are teaching those principles that will help to bring about the abolition of capitalism in the quickest and surest way.

F. HESLEY.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. ANDREW.

ANDREW CARNEGIE, library purveyor and morality expert (what a tribe of experts there seems to be in the world) has been at it again. He thinks "wealth is so obviously unequally distributed that the attention of civilised man must be attracted to it from time to time." He adds "no amount of charity in spending fortunes in any way compensates for misconduct in making them." He quotes with approval President Roosevelt's statement that he "would discriminate in the sharpest way between fortunes well won and fortunes ill won, between those gained well as a whole and those gained in evil fashion by keeping just within the bounds of mere law honesty," and concludes, "There are fortunes swollen beyond all healthy limits; but I say—my partners are the people!"

o o o

Dear, good Saint Andrew! His partners are the people. How true! How true! Of course they are all in the firm. All partners of the somnolent variety—sleeping partners in short. And while they sleep Andrew may sing on and preen his flight feathers prettily, preparatory to taking his place in the angelic choir wherein he has already, with canny prescience, booked a prominent place, as I doubt not. Well for Andrew, now and presently, if his shrewdness impel him to take his departure before his sleeping partners wake; for I fear me much that it will be woe indeed for Andrew if he should in that day be with us in the flesh.

o o o

"There are fortunes swollen beyond all healthy limit." Most upright judge! "No amount of charity in spending fortunes in any way compensates for misconduct in making them." Oh! a Daniel come to judgment! What a lead for the "partners" when they wake! Under the spur of such urging, under the whip of such counsel, how readily will they locate the owner of the fortune which, despite all its possessor's

widely advertised and loudly lauded efforts to dispose of it, persists in accumulating without even a hand-stir effort on the part of its owner; and how quick will they be to recognise this "fortune swollen beyond all healthy limit." And when they hear the story of Pittsburgh and how the history of its rise and development has stank in the nostrils of "civilised man" for years, in what a flash will come the appreciation of the inwardness of Andrew's other pronouncement as to the insufficiency of charity to compensate for the methods by which fortunes are built up.

Verily there is a great day in store for the "partners" and for Andrew—when the sleepers wake. And one of the surest signs that the "partners" still snore, is in the fact that Andrew can walk abroad giving off his smug and unctious dicta without risk of more than a halting effort at half humorous protest even from the most desperately "advanced" organs of public opinion. Well, the sleepers will not always sleep. There's a good time coming and the Laird of Skibo's share in that good time may not be altogether what he would himself design.

And I'm not quite sure that, assuming he has left us before that day dawns, he will be quite happy in that "undiscovered country from whose bourne" etc. I claim no special knowledge in the matter, but I am reminded of the story told, upon as good authority as any story of the sort, of the experience of one, Pullman, who at one time was in the sleeping car business (these sleeping cars were not much used, I believe, by Andrew's sleeping "partners" referred to). It chanced that Pullman died and found himself at heaven's gate whereat he knocked loudly. In response to his peremptory summons Peter appeared and of him Pullman demanded admittance. "And who are you?" asked Peter. "I'm Pullman," answered the applicant, "Pullman, of Pullman, U.S.A." "Ah!" said Peter, "I think we have heard something of you. Will you be good enough to wait a moment while I refer to my instructions?" And Peter opened a large book on his janitor's desk. "Well, hurry up then," quoth Pullman. "I'm not accustomed to being detained in this way. My time's precious." Peter turned the leaves leisurely. "Don't worry," said he. "Time doesn't matter quite so much here as it does where you came from. Ah! here we are. Pullman of Pullman, U.S.A. M—yes! I thought I was not mistaken. Will you kindly take a seat in the lift yonder." Pullman entered the lift and waited. The liftman made no sign. "Well, what's the matter? Why don't you start?" he asked. "There's no hurry," replied the liftman. "I'm expecting a few more along shortly. We generally fill up fairly quick." Pullman stumped about impatiently and one or two more came in, but the lift was still not full. "Come! Come!" he said, "I shan't get in to-day if you're much longer. When are we going up?" "Sir," replied the attendant, "this lift does not go up!"

A. JAMES.

BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, &c. to be obtained of the S.P.G.B., 28, Cursitor St., London, E.C.

CAPITAL (Karl Marx) ...	5s. 6d.
SIX CENTURIES OF WORK AND WAGES (Thorold Rogers) ...	5s. 6d.
POVERTY (Rowntree) ...	4s. 6d.
SOCIALIST STANDARD Vols. I. & II (Bound) each	3s. 0d.
MANIFESTO and RULES of the S.P.G.B. ...	1½d.
FROM HANDICRAFT TO CAPITALISM (Kautsky) ...	1½d.
COMMUNIST MANIFESTO ...	2½d.
WAGE LABOUR & CAPITAL (Marx) ...	1½d.
JONES' BOY ...	1½d.
SOCIALISM & THE WORKER (Sorge) ...	1½d.
HOW I BECAME A SOCIALIST (Morris) ...	1½d.
THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION (Kautsky) ...	7½d.

ALL POST FREE.

Printed by Jacob Bros., (T.U.), 2a Wingfield Road, Stratford E., for the Proprietors, The Socialist Party of Great Britain, and published at 28, Cursitor Street, London.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

HOLDS

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master-class, and the consequent enslavement of the working-class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working-class from the domination of the master-class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working-class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist-class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working-class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working-class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master-class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

NOW READY.

S.P.G.B. LIBRARY, No. 2.

From Handicraft to Capitalism,

Translated from the German of
KARL KAUTSKY.

The only translation in the English language of this important section of the famous "Das Erfurter Program."

POST FREE ... 1½d.

S.P.G.B., 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

The Head Office of The Socialist Party of Great Britain is at 28, Cursitor Street, London E.C.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

HEAD OFFICE:

28, CURSITOR STREET, LONDON, E.C.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—A. Jones, Secretary, 3, Mathew St., Latchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at S.P.G.B., Laburnum House, 134, High Street, Battersea, S.W. Club open every evening.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Executive Committee. Applications should be sent to the General Secretary.

EAST HAM.—W. Gifford, Sec., 31, Maryland Square, Stratford. Branch meets Mondays at 7.30 a 447, Katherine Rd., Forest Gate.

EDMONTON.—Sidney Auty, Sec. 60, Gilpin Grove, Edmonton. Branch meets Wednesdays 8.30.

FULHAM.—J. Humphries, Secretary, 309, North End Rd. Branch meets Feb. 15 and alternate Fridays at 8.30, at Ingram's Coffee Tavern, Fulham Cross.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Fri. at 8.30 at 79, Grove Rd., Holloway. Communications to the Sec.

PADDINGTON.—T. A. Wilson, Sec., 90, Mortimer Road, Kensal Rise, W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at Harley's Coffee Tavern (foot of Lock Bridge), Harrow Road.

PECKHAM.—W. Wren, Sec., 91, Evelina Rd., Nunhead, S.E. Branch meets every Wed. at 8.30.

ROMFORD DIVISION.—All communications to the Secretary, S.P.G.B. Club, 39, York Road, Ilford. Branch meets Mondays at 8 at Club.

TOOTING.—P. Dumenil, Secretary, 36, Byton Road Tooting, S.W. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. at Gorrings Dining Rooms, Gorrings Park Parade, Tooting Junction.

TOTTENHAM.—T. Lobb, Sec. Branch meets Mon. & at p.m., at Sunbeam Coffee Tavern, High Rd.

WATFORD.—T. Wilkins, Sec., 4, Marlborough Rd. Branch meets alternate Fridays at 8 p.m.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Mondays 7.30, followed at 8.30 by discussion, at 447, Katherine Road, Forest Gate.

WOOD GREEN.—H. Crump, Secretary, 39, Hermitage Road, Harringay, N. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Sundays at 3.30.

WOOLWICH & PLUMSTEAD.—A. E. Rance, Sec., 71a, Marmadon Rd., Plumstead. Branch meets on 2nd and 4th Wednesdays in month at 80, Conway Road, Plumstead.

INFORMATION

concerning the Party can be obtained of the following

BIRMINGHAM.—H. Oldknow, 227, St. Saviour's Road, Saltley.

BRADFORD (Yorks).—Ben Wilde, 78, Godwin St.

BURTON-ON-TRENT.—J. Blundell, 157, New St.

LIVERPOOL.—J. M. O. Sullivan, 4, Laburnum Grove, Litherland.

MANCHESTER.—J. Marsh, 97, Blantyre Street, Swinton, Nr. Manchester.

WHOLESALE AGENTS FOR THE SOCIALIST STANDARD.

HENDERSON, 16, Paternoster Row, E.C.

JOHN HEYWOOD, Ltd., Deansgate, Manchester.

W. H. SMITH & SON, Blackfriars St., Manchester.

J. NAYLOR & Co., 147 & 149, Gt. Junction Street, Leith.

RETAIL AGENTS.

JACQUES, 191, Old Street, E.C.

SMITH (late Manners), 47, Fetter Lane, E.C.

VESPERMAN, 251, Gray's Inn Road, W.C.

WREN, 91, Evelina Road, Nunhead, S.E.

ROOK, 9a, Cursitor Street, E.C.

GRANT, Ilford Hill, Ilford.

SIMPSON, 209, Leytonstone Road, Stratford, E.

BREWSTER, 153, Barking Rd., Canning Town.

WARNE, 1a, Queen's Square, Upton Park, E.

MENHINICK, 40, King William St., London B'dge.

FOX, 18a, New Kent Road, S.E.

BURKE, 35, Ford Street, Bow, E.

Miss DICKENSON, 96, Laureston St., Edinburgh.

E. WALLACE, 78, Fountainbridge, Edinburgh.

P. MACINNES, 3, West Nicholson St., Edinburgh.

GEDD, 181, Dalry Road, Edinburgh.

SHELLEY BOOK AGENCY, Gloucester Street, Oxford.

H. RUBIN, 13, Cottenham St., Westgate Hill, Newcastle-on-Tyne.

E. G. SMITH, 126, Tunnel Road, Liverpool.

ASHWORTH, 178, London Road, Manchester.

N. MELLINSKY, 34, Meanwood Rd., Leeds.

A. POLLOCK, 18, Richardson St., Halifax.

W. K. LIGGATT, 27, Stevenson St., Calton, Glasgow.

L. MACARTNEY, 181, Overgate, Dundee.

LEWIS, Wood Street, Walthamstow.

McPHEELY, 33, London Road, Glasgow.

LOGAN, 1, Macfarlane St., Gallowgate, Glasgow.

HIGGINS, 52, Argyle St., Anderston, Glasgow.

MARTIN, 368, Govan St., S.S. Glasgow.

HUNTER, 151, Main St., Gorbals, Glasgow.

McDONALD, 203, Castle St., Townhead, Glasgow.

NAYLOR, 1776, Gt. Junction St., Leith.

NAYLOR, 1a, Bowling Green St., Leith.

The
Official Organ
or
The
Socialist Party
of
Great Britain.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

No. 33. Vol. 3.]

LONDON, MAY, 1907.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

THE BLIGHT OF SNOBBERY.

An Organisation of "Respectable" Workers.

NOTWITHSTANDING our past efforts to point the more excellent way to the Railway Clerks' Association, that organisation of the more "respectable" railway employees, like the ploughman of the famous Elegy, still continues to pursue its dull and melancholy way. Its latest lucubration makes it clear that although as their watch-word in large capitals informs us "Association is the law of Progress," it does not follow that progress must accompany association. Intellectual progress (the analogy is intended to be void of offence) would not, for example, result from wooden heads be they never so closely associated. A silk purse is not the outcome of the association of sows' ears. Two years ago we gently argued with the R.C.A. in an endeavour to show that its position was unhappy and untenable, yet to-day it comes along with pretty much the same sort of fallacious pronouncement. It has had two years of association but that has not connoted progress—of intellect anyhow.

This is its statement of some reasons why railway clerks should combine—preferably in the R.C.A.:

On nearly every railway there are evidences of reactionary tendencies which will become very detrimental to the welfare of the clerical staff unless steps are taken to counteract them. Salaries are being kept down, staff reduced, holidays made more difficult to obtain, returns are multiplied, and office work made heavier and more complicated every year. Sunday business increases without any extra remuneration being allowed to clerks who are called upon to sacrifice their Sabbath. Girl clerks are introduced to keep down the standard of the men, and the word "Economy" is abused wherever opportunity allows. Instead of Railway Clerks participating in the general improvement of trade and the increase of National wealth, their condition is either stationary or declining while Railway revenues are steadily advancing. Prospects of promotion diminish every year through the introduction of young men from universities who have undue preference over experienced capable men amongst the general staff.

Excepting that it seems to be assumed that if railway clerks would but join the R.C.A. they would participate in the increase of National wealth—an absurd assumption of course—this statement, doubtless, fairly represents some of the conditions of railway clerical labour. It is what we should expect to find seeing that railway clerks are in the same position as any other section of the working class—the position of an exploited or robbed class. In common with the rest of the workers they have to sell their labour-power for wages, and any hardening of their conditions simply means that the capitalist class, who buy their labour-power, are endeavouring to squeeze a little extra surplus value out of the deal—whether the exigencies of industrial conflict necessitate such squeezing in order that dividends may be maintained, doesn't matter for present purposes.

The operation may be ill-advised from a capitalist point of view. It might be better business for them to make, for example, the surroundings of their employees more congenial; but they, natur-

ally, would only consider that matter favourably if they could see that it was possible to get greater profits out of the improvement. It is their concern for profits which is the actuating motive, not the increased comfort and happiness of their wage-slaves, and they may be relied upon to make any such alterations in their own interests without any assistance from an organisation of employees.

The R.C.A. or any other such body presumably does not exist for the purpose of informing the master class of the best means of getting larger profits. Seeing that all profit is obtained from the exploitation of the workers, they (the workers) are not concerned with being party to the increase of that robbery—not unless they are very stupid. It is no advantage to them if they are translated into conditions which enable them to speed up their energies to permit of three days' work being done in two, when, as is inevitable, the speeding-up process results in the production of an earlier state of decrepitude. They are concerned, or should be, in securing, if possible, some *real* advantage—a benefit which has no counterbalancing loss.

If we are agreed so far, it will at once be seen that such benefit cannot be obtained except at the expense of capitalists' profits. And the capitalist is not going to relinquish any portion of the profits, upon which his existence depends, without a struggle. Into this struggle the worker, out for increased benefits, must fling himself willy-nilly. There is no other way for him. He cannot achieve his purpose by "blarney," by pleading the misery of his lot, by appealing to the "higher nature" of his employer. Capitalism knows no higher nature. It only knows higher profits. The worker has got to go into the struggle. And his measure of success will be the measure of his appreciation of the conditions of the conflict.

The conditions of the conflict are simple. He is fighting as a worker **Class** against the capitalist whose interests are absolutely and entirely **Struggle.** opposed to his own. It is not a fight of individuals either. It is not him *versus* his employer. If it were he would go under at once because his employer has always the unemployed reserve to fall back upon and all he has to do is to sack his "hand" and get a new one from the hungry crowd clamorously appealing for work outside. It is not even a section of workers against a section of capitalists. Threaten a section of the institution of profit-mongering seriously, and immediately the capitalist section becomes a capitalist class with all the forces that Capital can command hurrying up to the defence of one of its citadels. The sectional struggles of the workers since the rise of capitalism are in evidence as proof of this. A *Tory* mine-owner (Masham) calls upon a capitalist *Liberal* Government for help against his striking workers, and in a twinkling we have the soldiery shooting down the workers in revolt. Scores of cases could be cited if space allowed.

The struggle then is between class and class. When the workers recognise that, they will have

appreciated the conditions of their battle and will organise their forces on a class basis accordingly. As it is they organise sectionally, enter the fight sectionally, and are beaten in detail by the opposing forces acting in concert, with their economic power buttressed by political power controlling the armaments of the country. The working class in such circumstances are in a condition of pitiable impotence. Under the direction of leaders either fraudulent or ignorant they waste their substance and their strength with a recklessness at once prodigal and imbecile. And if as a result of repeated efforts repeatedly smashed, they fall back hopeless, dispirited, apathetic, what wonder is it?

But even if any ground existed for the supposition that sectional fights might be productive of good, it would be at once conceded that the larger the section, the better the chances of success. If the railway workers could take sectional action for sectional benefit to themselves as railway workers, it would surely be allowed at once that such action ought to be taken by the whole of the railway workers. The larger the association, the more effective the action—that is always argued by the trade union leaders. And yet we have the Railway Clerks' Association coming along to railway workers, mouthing "union is strength" and the rest of the inconsequentialities of trade union stock-in-trade, to urge that a section of a section should organise themselves separately—without connection with any other firm in the same street!

Here is the acme even of trade union absurdity. Railway clerks must combine separately. In the name of the ten-a-penny gods, why? Because their interests are separate and distinct from the interests of the rest of railway workers! Really, I hardly know whether this is rant or cant or fustian. The interests of clerks are as distinct from those of engine drivers as the interests of platelayers are distinct from those of porters—neither more nor less. Therefore—a platelayers' union, and a carriage washers' union, and a porters' union, and two or three score other unions in the same industrial section! Why not?

The fact is, of course, that the R.C.A. is endeavouring to play up or down to the "respectability" of the clerk. He doesn't wear corduroys—therefore his interests are different. He wears a black coat which, perhaps, poor devil, he hasn't paid for—and therefore his ways are not the ways of the carman who, probably, wouldn't have a coat at all if the Company in its large-hearted charity didn't supply him with one. He is a superior person our railway clerk, and must be treated "as such."

Of course, this cult of the bob-tailed coat is a live thing with railway clerks or the R.C.A. would be unable to exploit it. But it is none the less a manifestation of clerkly ignorance, not less but more pitifully ludicrous because it is crowned with the stove-pipe hat of caste. Clerks, railway or other, will have to recognise the essential unity of their interests with those

of the more horny-handed sons of labour if they are to effect any material change in their condition. As members of the working class themselves there is no progress for them apart from the general advance of their class. Any organisation they may be associated with not based upon this conception of class solidarity coupled with the recognition of the conditions of the conflict they are consciously or unconsciously participating in to-day—conditions briefly set out in the foregoing—is not an organisation at all for their purposes. It is simply a delusion and a snare from which, when wisdom comes, they will flee—after giving it a parting kick as a mark of their esteem.

Does the Railway Clerks' Association give even a fleeting intimation of its recognition of the essentials of working-class organisation? To that

question we have to answer to-day as we have answered before—not one. On the contrary it seems to lay itself out to show that more appalling stupidity, more abysmal ignorance can find lodgement in the clerical breast—or that part of their anatomy clerks usually think with—than in the mental fit-up of any other species of proletarian. The public pronouncement previously referred to after detailing some of the reasons for organisation on the part of railway clerks, goes on with sublime fatuity (or stupendous cheek) to say—

The Association advocates nothing of a character likely to be detrimental to proper discipline or the best interests of the Railway Companies, and one of its aims is to promote a better understanding between Directors, Officers and Staff.

Is there any "Labour" organisation maintaining itself leech-like upon working-ignorance anywhere, that can beat that for folly? Here are workmen acquiescing in the announcement made by their leaders with an air of authoritative wisdom to the effect that on the one hand out of their own pence the men are voluntarily creating an organisation for the purpose of looking after the best interests of their employers, while on the other they assert they have entered into association to protect themselves against their employers! Apparently the R.C.A. is of opinion that the best way to fight the employer is to kill him with kindness—a method for which, perhaps, something might be said if the employer under such treatment did not take so unconscionable a time in dying.

And this is the organisation which railway clerks are strongly pressed to join; an organisation without a glimmer of understanding of the working-class position; an organisation whose idea of association is to sub-divide the working class into as many sections and sub-sections as the numerical strength will allow; an organisation that conducts its campaign against capitalism by studying the best interests of capitalism and modifying its own action to conform to the requirements of those best interests! How the board-rooms must ring with the laughter of the great-hearted Directors when the news comes in of the steps their clerical workers are taking to secure some amelioration in their hard condition. Small wonder that Directors of Companies sat at one time—whether they do or not, now, does not appear in the document under notice—in the presidential and vice-presidential chairs of the R.C.A.—it was most excellent good business for them.

And small wonder also that such an organisation should have as its most prominent figure, the nominee of a person of so malodorous a reputation as the President of the Local Government Board. Alderman W. J. West, J.P., the nominee referred to, is the President of the R.C.A. and under the aegis of Burns stood as L.C.C. candidate for Battersea, vice Burns himself, (who had been called to higher things by his too satisfied capitalist paymasters). We had the satisfaction of doing something toward the defeat of Mr. West's pseudo-Progressive and confusionist candidature, just as we hope to have the satisfaction of doing something toward defeating the work of Mr. West's pseudo-labour confusionist organisation.

That is our business in life as a The Duty Socialist Party. We are out of combat working-class error, and invincible though the error seems when manifested in such appalling pronouncements as the one quoted from above, we are by no means dismayed. To some number we who form the S.P.G.B. are clerks ourselves

and have some intimate knowledge of the forces which operate to produce in the clerk that sense of snobbish superiority which is so pitiable because based upon such slender ground—as the clerks themselves make patent every time they "spread" themselves to achieve dialectical effects in political or economic discussion. As the Emerald Islander would put it, "they can never open their mouth without putting their foot in it." Break down the fancy line of caste, however, let in upon him the light of the Socialist philosophy that raises (or reduces) the man with the hoe to the level of the man with the pen, and the clerk takes his place with the rest of the working class and may be relied upon to do his share in the work of breaking down the society forms behind which the forces of capitalism lie entrenched, and setting to utter rout those forms thus unmasked.

We despair neither of the clerk nor the navy. Pressure of economic forces will compel him to cast about for the means of economic salvation, as in fact it is doing to-day, and although his untutored efforts may be temporarily arrested by charlatan or fool and his energies switched off and wasted in absurd organisations of the type of the R.C.A., it must occur that, in the result, for the very simple reason that the Socialist Party alone holds the solution of the industrial problem, he must turn to the Socialist Party for the way of escape. The Socialist Party alone can explain the phenomena of economic cataclysm. The Socialist Party alone can unravel the tangled skein of working-class hardship and poverty and insecurity. And in the Socialist they advocate can adequate and final remedy be found. "There is no other name given under Heaven whereby we may be saved" except Socialism.

Our appeal to the clerks of the R.C.A. and to every other member of the exploited working class is that they should concentrate their mental energies upon a fair and full consideration of the Socialist position. The result will be sure. It will be death to the Railway Clerks' Association and all other such causes of working-class confusion, but it will mean life to the railway clerk and to the rest of the proletariat.

A. JAMES.

TOTTENHAM BRANCH REPORT.

The Tottenham Branch are still striving, still spending their time in propagating the principles of Socialism and have scarcely had time to report. Our membership is steadily increasing but our numbers (which are not small) are insignificant compared with the number of sympathisers that gather around our platform. Tottenham has been in the throes of electionitis and we joined in the fray, advising the worker, by voice and pen, to abstain from voting their enemies into power. We captured one meeting organised by a Liberal and finished with three rousing cheers for Socialism.

Considering the inclement weather our outdoor propaganda has been excellent. Thanks to the help of the Edmonton comrades, close on 40 meetings have been held during the last quarter. Our "Salisbury" meeting has been held over for a few weeks, but we hope to be there again before this report is in print. We continue to hold huge meetings at West Green Corner, despite the fact that humorous personalities are indulged in by speakers from the platform of an alleged Socialist party near our pitch. We are still running our discussion class after Branch meetings. All comrades and others are welcome.

T. W. LOBB, Branch Sec.

SLAVE r. "FREE" LABOUR.

"Caesar," said a planter to one of his Negro slaves, "shin up thet that tree an' thin out ther branches some." The Negro showed no disposition to reply, and being urged with language customary of the time and place, answered, "Yaas, Massa, me go plenty quick, Massa, but dis chile 'im tink, s'pose Caesar 'im fa' down—dat's berry bad job fo' Massa: Caesar 'im cost lot o' money. Spec Massa better send Irish Mike. If white man fa' down dat aint no loss t'nobody, nohow."

RANDOM NOTES.

BERNARD SHAW has a three column article in the *Clarion* upon "the moral of the L.C.C. elections," one column and a half of which is devoted to his showing, mainly on the evidence of the return of Sidney Webb and Frank Smith, that the results of those elections do not spell defeat for Socialism. The other column and a half is mainly devoted to supporting the contention of Robert Blatchford, that the results of the elections do spell defeat for Socialism! And yet we are urged by the quidnunc and the cognoscente to believe that Shaw is not merely the farcure he has been represented, but, on the contrary, is a desperately earnest person.

The *Tribune* (April 1st) quotes this from the report of the Executive of the S.D.F. to their annual conference:—

It is necessary here to call attention to the conduct of Mr. John Burns, who, as President of the Local Government Board, has now gone back entirely upon his former opinions, and the most hypocritical employer of sweated labour, with a predilection for conventional Sunday-school morality, might well envy the power of glib pharisaical cant which the "man with the red flag" can now always bring to bear upon the unemployed question.

and this is the S.D.F. conception of correct tactics on the unemployed question:—

This conference further calls upon the Government at once to amend the existing Unemployed Workmen Act to such an extent as to provide useful and remunerative work for unemployed men, and to make sufficient grants from the Imperial Exchequer to local authorities to enable them to give employment to all citizens in need of it.

And then reflect that Burns is at the head of the Governmental department which must deal with the call "to provide useful and remunerative work," etc. And that the Government is, according to the S.D.F., representative of capitalist interests. And that, also according to the S.D.F., capitalist interests absolutely rely upon continued labour redundancy. So, we will call upon the capitalist Government to put into operation the pharisaical cant of their obedient servant, the ex-"man with the red flag," in order that the unemployed upon whom capitalist interests depend, may obtain the work that the capitalist Government cannot provide!

Sweet, isn't it? Likely to have an exceedingly enlightening effect upon the working class the S.D.F. allege they are educating—what? Don't tell the unemployed that the capitalist Government can do nothing for them. That would be the truth, of course, but it wouldn't be good "tactics." Therefore we will lead them to suppose that the Government can do something for them, and we will call upon the Government to do that something which they cannot! So will our reputation as practical politicians grow.

May the beneficent fates turn the hungry eyes of the uneducated working-class unemployed away from such tactic-struck educators. And may the same beneficent fates turn the brains of those well-intentioned S.D.F. rank-and-filers in order that they may see their own stupidity in following with such pathetic fidelity the fatuous leading of their purblind—or is it pharisaical—captains. We offer the beneficent fates aforementioned, the columns of *THE SOCIALIST STANDARD* as a medium for the expression of their powers. Indeed, the S.D.F. man may rightly regard these columns as the instrument which the fates are using to divert his path from that abyss of political impotence toward which his unthinking steps are being urged by the tactical grotesques he hails as leaders. If he will not so regard these columns, he must needs gang his ain gait (I hope that's good Scots) and suffer the penalty which "baffle-headedness" always invokes. And he may count himself a fortunate fellow if he awakes from his somnambulist perambulations before he finds himself up to his neck in a slough of despond, being impelled by the obnoxious brickbats of a long-suffering working class.

At the annual dinner of the athletic club of Messrs. J. Lyons & Co's employees, the chairman (Mr. Isidore Gluckstein) in responding to the vote of thanks to the directors of the Company for the support they had given the club, remarked that they were pleased to encourage athletics among their staff because "outdoor sports not only bettered a man physically but enabled him to do his indoor work all the better." So, scratch the benevolent director and you find the hungry capitalist. It is good for the men that they should be physically robust. It is also good business for the employer. And the greatest of these (to the employer) is the good business.

The *Paris Herald* reports the death, in Pittsburgh, of John Brislin, the inventor of modern rolling mill machinery. John was a boyhood friend of Andrew Carnegie, and John thought, when, in conjunction with Anton Vinnac, he perfected his patent, that his old pal, Andrew, who was in the steel business, would see him through all right. Instead of which, John and Anton had to take action against the Carnegie Steel Company for stealing and working their patent. They estimated their invention to be worth 40,000,000 dollars. Andrew's company offered them 100,000 dollars. They refused and the States District Court gave a verdict in their favour. Then old pal Andrew's company took the case to the Federal Court of Appeal which, being a court of commercial justice and Andrew's company easily having the most money, naturally reversed the order of the lower court. Having no more money to fight, Anton died of grief and John lost his eyesight and Andrew by the grace of God and the poverty of his old pal, waxed fat upon the invention that didn't belong to him and began to make a name as a philanthropist and library purveyor. Recently John received a letter from Andrew in which Andrew seems to have held out some hope that John might expect some justice soon and John was so shocked that he died of heart failure.

Under Socialism of course, it will be impossible for genius to reap the reward due to it. It is only under capitalism that genius can hope to secure adequate recognition. All the same I don't marvel that John died.

There is no other movement in the world, unless perhaps the Christian Church, which numbers among its professed followers so many who fail to understand or appreciate the meaning and application of its fundamental teachings, as does Socialism in England. This is the more remarkable as the points in dispute are scientific facts, capable of the fullest and most complete demonstration.

E. J. LAMEL in "Justice," 6.4.07.

Many a true word spoken even in *Justice*. We entirely agree with Mr. Lamel, but cannot allow the exception which he makes in favour of the S.D.F., to which he belongs.

Our objection to the S.D.F. is quite as strong as Mr. Lamel's objection to the pseudo-Socialists who will have none of the S.D.F. because that organisation refuses "to accept an anemic, milk-and-water 'Socialism' as the genuine, full-blooded article." And our objection to the S.D.F. is for very much the same reason. S.D.F. "Socialism" is anemic and milk-and-water as Mr. Lamel will find if he will peruse fairly the statement of the position set out in the Manifesto of The Socialist Party of Great Britain (price 1d.).

It is curious, too, to find a writer like Mr. Lamel, who seems to pose as an exponent of the scientific view, making reference to the private ownership of land and capital, as though the common ownership of capital, like the common ownership of land, was conceivable. He speaks of the predictions of Marx with the air of one who has Marx at his finger-tips. But if he really knew his Marx he would not confuse (as he appears to do) capital with wealth.

Nor would he fall into the error common among those unscientific persons whom he so vigorously frowns, that the working class which "suffered the most" in prosecuting the South African War, "now has, directly or indirectly, to pay the piper." As a matter of fact

the working class temporarily benefited by the industrial incentive which the war gave. And if it is true, as Mr. Lamel states (a statement in which the "scientific Socialist" will concur), that the working class "has to rely for its livelihood upon the proceeds of its labour" (read labour-power) "sold as a ware," it will be interesting to know how the working class can "pay the piper," having regard to the fact, accepted by all "scientific Socialists," that competition for work reduces the average working-class return to a bare subsistence level.

These points are urged, not with a view of scoring off Mr. Lamel's ignorance, but rather with the idea of suggesting to Mr. Lamel and those who stand with him, that just as the S.P.G.B. has been at pains to establish itself on what Mr. Lamel may regard as the minutiae of Marxian economics, so it has been at pains to discover the error of the pseudo-Socialist Parties in order that it might, by dissociating itself from such error, and the confusion which it must inevitably work, present a clear issue to the working class.

This clear issue is absolutely necessary to enable the working class to begin to build up that organisation upon which it must rely in the struggle of the future. That is essential to class-conscious action—the only action that can effect working-class emancipation. Wherefore, to Mr. Lamel and all those whose desire it is to do all that men may to forward the revolution, we throw out the challenge to show us wherein our position is unsound. Failing that—and in the three years of our existence it has not been done once—we insist that the S.P.G.B. is the only Party of the workers, and that in it all Socialists (the term connotes a scientific appreciation of all the facts of the economic situation and needs no qualification) should be organised for the purpose of giving effective assistance in the working-class struggle for freedom.

At the meeting of the London Central Unemployed Committee (April 5th)—

Mr. Lansbury said he thought it was time the Body seriously considered their position. THEY HAD FOOLED THE UNEMPLOYED LAST WINTER. They had the amusing spectacle of Parliament voting £200,000 and setting up in London elaborate and costly machinery, and yet they had not been able to spend that money in providing work.

They had registered the unemployed, investigated their birth, and "inquired" them up and down London, and the result had been that a petty few thousand had received a few weeks' employment. He protested against the way in which things were being managed and against the man at the head of affairs and the whole of his wretched department.

He protested against the return of £90,000 to the Treasury and against the man who was doing it. The Liberal Government was fooling the unemployed.

And this is the organisation brought into existence by the Government measure for which the S.D.F. claimed credit! This is the abortion which was hailed by "Labour" members, (and those who want to be "Labour" members,) as something very like a revolution. For the first time, we were told, Parliament had recognised its duty towards the out-of-work. For the first time the legislature had admitted its moral obligation—and so on. We pointed out at the time that the thing was a fraud—must be a fraud and could not by any chance be any other. And now Lansbury comes along to say that the unemployed has been "inquired" and "fooled" and that practically nothing had been done or could be done.

What now? Well, if the unemployed are not sick to death of the dreary business; if they are content to believe that their self-styled representatives in the House are doing everything needful or possible; if they can still manage to find spiritual sustenance from the faith that is in them—faith in others doing what they require—if these things still are, then the next step will be the step that was taken last. And it will be productive of the same result. But if the unemployed recognise the futility of starving and insist for themselves upon the right to the things which are life, then, although the unemployed problem will not be solved, they will not be hungry.

There is no solution for the unemployed problem short of Socialism. The working class sooner or later must recognise that and organise accordingly for the overthrow of capitalist domination. But in the meantime? Well, in the meantime they will get the equivalent of nothing unless they evince a determination to refuse to starve quietly—unless, in short, they constitute themselves a menace to the peace of mind of the master class. We are no advocates of rioting because an unarmed mob versus a well disciplined, well armed force means immediate defeat for the rioters. The most powerful menace to official complacency is the growth of a class-conscious working-class organisation. Given that and a refusal to be satisfied with promises or with anything short of the extirpation of capitalism, and doles will come tumbling down as manna from heaven. Take the doles in your stride but do not allow them to divert you from your purpose a hair's breadth. Concentrate upon the work for the working class and, as the scriptures have it, all other things shall be added unto you.

ALGERIA.

POPULATION AND PAUPERISM.

ACCORDING to a statistical abstract issued by the Board of Trade, the United Kingdom was in 1905 fifth amongst the nations of the world in point of population, being exceeded by Russia, the United States, Germany, and—strange to say—Japan. Whereas we had 43,221,000 people in 1905, compared with 39,221,000 in 1895, the corresponding figures relating to Japan are 47,975,000 and 42,271,000 respectively. Many people, including the Bishops, profess to be seriously alarmed at the decrease in our birth-rate; but the curious thing is that those who are most concerned about our birth-rate are doing their best to further reduce the population by promoting schemes for emigration. If such schemes only dealt with "undesirables," they would be an unmixed blessing; but their promoters are only too careful to let it be known that "No wastrels need apply"; and, as a matter of fact, such would not be accepted on the other side, even if they managed to elude observation on this. What, then, is going on is that the bone and sinew of the country is being sent away, while the weaklings are left behind to swell our workhouse population and crowd the shelters of the Salvation Army.

We have no means of knowing how pauperism is dealt with in the other countries of the world; but our own poor we have "always with us." It would appear, from a recent return, that there are at present in London more than 123,000 paupers, or at the rate of 26 per 1,000 of the population, this mass of pauperism being greater than in any year since 1872, except 1904 and 1905. It appears, too, that while out-door pauperism is decreasing, the rush to the workhouses continues, and that there are now in the London workhouses 78,603 paupers—which is the highest number ever recorded. Many of the workhouses are either overcrowded or full, and the Guardians are at their wits' end to know how to deal with the overflow. The ratio of paupers differs in a remarkable manner in the different workhouse centres of the Metropolis. Thus in Hampstead it is as low as 8.5 per 1,000, while in the Strand it is as high as 76.4 and in Holborn as 49.4. Again, 15.1 in Fulham compares with 47.5 in Poplar and 47.3 in Bermondsey; while Wandsworth is as low as 17.1 and Camberwell (in the same district) as high as 32.9. In the Western district Paddington comes out at 15.8 and Chelsea at 31.2, or just double; while Kensington at 17.0 compares with St. George's at 29.3, and with Westminster at 24.8. No doubt there must always be a wide range in districts so differently circumstanced; but the excessive ratios in the Strand and Holborn seem to call for special explanation. Outside London the number of paupers relieved on July 1, 1906, was 731,344, and this, added to the number in London, makes a grand total of 865,794 for the United Kingdom, being at the rate of 25.1 per 1,000 of the population, as compared with 26 in London alone.

Financial News.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, subscriptions for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, articles, correspondence and advertisements submitted for insertion therein should be addressed.—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 2, Great James Street, London, W.C., to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD is published on the first Saturday in each month.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office every Tuesday at 7 p.m.

Terms of Subscriptions.

UNITED KINGDOM.		
Twelve Months	...	1s. 6d.
Six Months	...	9d.
AMERICA.		
Twelve Months	...	50 cents.
Six Months	...	25 cents.

Scale of Charges for Advertisements.

	£	s.	d.
Per Inch, One Insertion	...	0	2
Quarter Column do.	...	0	5
Half Column do.	...	0	10
One Column do.	...	1	0

Special arrangements will be made for Advertisements to be inserted in more than one issue.

The Socialist Standard,

SATURDAY, MAY 4, 1907.



The Significance of May-Day.

THE First of May of our own times is in direct contrast to the May-day of old. The old festival had an organic connection with the daily work of the people. The old games, the decorations of greenery and flowers, the bringing home of the May; these reflected the joy of all at the awakening of nature, at the promise of the crops to come, and at the growing light and warmth of the season. To-day, however, agriculture has ceased to occupy the premier place and is consequently no longer reflected in the holidays of the people. On St. Lubbock's days, it is true, the joyless proletariat have, at the dictates of manufacture, brief breathing spells; but these are no spontaneous festivals of the people, and brief though they be they are all too long for the scanty wages of many.

Agriculture itself is, indeed, with intensive culture and the growing use of machinery, fast becoming an industry. The increase in culture under shelter and the rapidity of communication with other climes also diminish greatly the importance of the seasons, and tend to complete the change wrought by the rise of manufacture in the significance of the First of May.

To the sentimentalist, even in these times, May-day is still the festival of nature, and represents the past to which he would fain return. He is indeed the true impossibilist. But May-day in that sense is a mockery to the modern wage-slave who, surrounded by a landscape of bricks and mortar, can see no change that betokens Nature's awakening from her winter slumbers.

The First of May, though nearly all its old associations are for ever lost, has now a new and deeper meaning. It comes to the toilers as seed time for the harvest to come; a seed time of fraternity and organisation with their fellows, for the harvest of deliverance from wage slavery. May-day yet retains a portion of its old significance; it is still a festival of the people, of those who work. No God has brought to these the word of Salvation, and no promise of a reward in Heaven can for ever dull them to present injustice. The proletariat's Revelation lies in its own toilsome life, and its Heaven can only be the result of its own efforts.

The first of May is, then, a worker's festival, a pledge of fraternity and internationalism, an awakening to the social mission of the working class. It is not a day that should be wasted by

the workers in begging crumbs from the groaning table of those who have robbed them, but a day of education and organisation; a marshalling of forces for the conquest of the world by Labour.

Science plus Practice.

Criticism is not usually the pleasantest of medicines, but in the right proportions it is undoubtedly beneficial. It is, however, most curious that those to whom a modicum of criticism would be most useful have in general the greatest objection to the dose. Thus we have some members of the various "Labour" parties objecting to criticism of their foolish organisations. They object that we criticise other parties too much, and sometimes hint that if we confined ourselves to theoretical and general articles we should have a much larger circulation for our official organ. Strangely enough those who deprecate our criticism of their pet "Labour" parties have no objection—quite the contrary—to our virile criticism of the orthodox political parties. Clearly, then, it is not trenchant criticism to which they object, but solely criticism of themselves.

It is probably true that a larger circulation and much praise could be obtained by masking our opinion of the pseudo-Socialist crowd, and we are aware that spread-eagle journals have been published at a profit by being "all things to all men," but the object of The Socialist Party is neither circulation nor praise, but the intelligent co-operation of the working class for Socialism. And in the education of the working class the analysis of contemporary political organisations is necessary and important.

Past issues of this journal show that the importance of the scientific side of our educational work is fully realised. Indeed, the principles of a genuine working-class party could be based on no superficial eclecticism. In view of the unity of all things, its conception of Society must be consistent with all the facts and consistent also with itself. A hotchpot of gleanings of worn-out capitalistic economics such as comprises the stock-in-trade of the average "labour leader," or a smattering of bourgeois learning and philosophy such as makes the mental furniture of perigrinating middle-class paradoxes, is no material upon which a world-wide working-class movement for the regeneration of Society can advance to a successful issue.

The science upon which the working-class can work out its deliverance must be harmonious and consistent as a whole and in logical relationship to the principles of science in general. We are therefore Marxians, since in the philosophy and economics of Marx we have those principles that alone can take their place in the scientific conception of organic and social life. Only Marxian economics can withstand the attacks of the interested apologists of capitalism. All the world over, capitalism rightly regards Marxian Socialism as the enemy, and the revisionists and pseudo-Socialist labour men, whose intellectual pabulum consists of the dregs of capitalist philosophy, are hailed by Press and platform of the ruling class as allies of the existing order against the "dogmatic" Socialists.

The primary importance of science, therefore, we clearly recognise; but just as criticism which is not based upon knowledge is worthless, so also theory, however sound, which is not translated into practice is useless. Your theorist pure and simple is a very pleasant man, he is indeed quite harmless—and as useless; but let a man with a true and consistent philosophy of things translate that philosophy into deeds, let him illuminate contemporaneous events with the light of his philosophy, and straightway he is transformed into a most unpleasant and "dogmatic" person to those in the wrong and to those whose practice is at variance with their theory.

Our Declaration of Principles shows definitely where we stand. It has not been, and we believe cannot be successfully attacked, and on it we consistently base our political policy. We are not, however, Simon Pures, for we know that mistakes are too easily made. A sound organisation will indeed learn from them and, if need be, rectify its policy. But it is not because they

have made mistakes that we oppose so-called "Labour" parties, but because of their persistent pursuit, in spite of protest, in spite of bitter working-class experience, of a policy of confusion and error. It is not because they have once halted by the way that we oppose the pseudo-Socialist parties, but because while professing to be based upon Socialist principles they persistently and, through their leaders, consciously violate those fundamental principles in their confusionist and place-hunting policy. Theory, we urge, must be wedded to practice.

The rank and file of these organisations we believe to be mainly disinterested and truth-seeking but as yet ignorant of the whole truth and hypnotised by personality, and it is our duty to place the truth before them and to break the spell that binds them. Both abstract science and criticism find their rightful place in our propaganda; frank and sincere criticism in order that error and charlatanism may be destroyed, and Socialist science as the basis of sound principles and policy.

It is true that the working class are outside and largely ignorant of all existing organisations, and it is of course our first duty to make them Socialists; but we should be truly culpable if through cowardice or mistaken tolerance we failed to show those we have converted that their new-found faith could not be advanced within such organisations as the "Labour Party," the I.L.P. and the S.D.F. For the spineless vote and subscription catching policies of these parties, their alliances with sections of the capitalist class, and the fact that they devote practically the whole of their energies to the furtherance of dozens of quack measures rather than to Socialism, show plainly that they are hopeless for the revolutionary Socialist movement. Indeed, if we failed to warn the workers of these pitfalls in their path, it would be worse than cowardice—it would be downright treachery.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

TRADE UNION LAW, by Herman Cohen of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-law. 2nd edition, Cloth, 6s. net. (Publishers, Sweet and Maxwell, Chancery Lane, W.C.)

MR. COHEN endeavours to make plain the state of the law regarding trade unions, and shows, incidentally, that the meaning of several sections of the new Act is open to question. To us the ambiguity of the law appears calculated; indeed, the law has yet to be passed through which, in a technical sense, it is impossible for a coach and four to be driven.

Many of the "labour leaders" fondly imagine that if a capitalist government could but be induced to pass certain laws all would be well. They are, however, oblivious of the fact that all capitalist laws (so far as the workers are concerned) are doubly damned; damned by ambiguity in the making, and damned by capitalist interests and control in the administration.

The ruling class are past masters in the art of bluff, and even if they, as a working-class soporific, pass any law they know that their political control enables them by judicious administration to make every such law serve capitalist interests.

The book before us (which can be obtained at greatly reduced rates through the London Trades Council) consists of 200 well printed pages and gives the text of the Trades Disputes Act, 1906, and of the various other Acts of Parliament directly affecting Trade Unions, together with explanations, comments, and the citation of cases in point. A useful book for the social student.

SOCIALISTIC LESSONS. Boggart Mill. By F. H. Rose, 20 pp., 1d. Pioneer Press, Manchester.

An illustrated story upon a basis of spiritualism, wherein an old and disused mill becomes the scene of the revenge of the spirits of departed factory children upon their masters and foremen whose spirits are chased to hell. The story is interestingly written but it is not easy to see why it deserves the title of a "Socialistic Lesson."

A LOOK ROUND.

MR. LOUIS A. HILL, to whose utterances I have previously referred in these columns, continues his advocacy of an Eight Hours Act for bakers and continues to make unprovable statements in connection therewith.

In communications to the *Daily News* and the *Daily Express* recently, he stated that the passing of the bill would "find work for practically every unemployed baker in London" and "would find employment in London alone for some 4,000 or 5,000 extra hands." Now in my humble opinion Mr. Hill knows he cannot justify these statements, hence his refusal to debate the matter with a member of the S.P.G.B., when asked to do so at the meeting of bakers held at Canning Town on February 9th.

In the February issue of the *Journeymen Bakers' Magazine*, Mr. Jenkins, General Secretary of the Amalgamated Union of Operative Bakers, reported that during the Labour Conference at Belfast he visited one of the largest and most up-to-date bakeries in the city, and "had special facilities offered me to examine the newest machinery that had been introduced from a labour-saving point of view, and found, as I had expected, that every development of machinery was throwing men out of work, the result being that 102 men were on the out-of-work list, so that with a 700 membership, one out of every seven were out of work, which represents a very serious state of things; up to now they have been able to deal with this small army of unemployed, but from all appearances they may be eventually hard pushed to provide for them unless by a serious increase of contributions, notwithstanding they are working under a 48 hour week."

According to the *British Baker* for April 19 last, Mr. Jenkins attended the Annual Dinner of the Portsmouth Branch of the A.U.O.B. & C. on April 10 and in replying to the toast of "The Amalgamated Union," laid special stress on the Eight Hours Day Bill for the Baking Trade now before Parliament, which had, he said, been rendered necessary by the excessive labour forced on those who could find employment, the result, in connection with modern improvement, being an ever-increasing army of unemployed bakers, which the proposed Bill would practically eliminate. Where ten or fifteen years since ten or eleven sacks was considered a fair output per man, now double that amount was the output in many of the factories, and it was evident that something to alter the conditions of the workers was an absolute necessity.

Once again I ask Mr. Hill, and also Mr. Jenkins, to reconcile their extravagant statements with the actual facts as admitted by, at any rate, the last-named.

That "Radical of Radicals," Mr. Horatio Bottomley, has made Mr. Featherstone Asquith a present of a suggestion, but does not for a moment suppose that Mr. Asquith will adopt it. He says: "An Old Age Pension of 5s. per week for every law-abiding citizen—whether otherwise 'deserving' or not—of the age of seventy years and upwards, who cares to claim it. That will exactly fit the case—and Mr. Asquith's name will go down to posterity as that of the great Chancellor who, out of the country's wealth, fed and clothed the aged when their powers of contributing to it were exhausted. No man could seek a higher reputation than this."

Oh! that will be joyful. Most members of the working class are "too old at forty." The great friendly societies, who take care only to enrol "good lives," show in their statistics the number of middle-aged members who, mainly because of unemployment, lapse. And if they can only manage to "hang on" until they are 70, and never break the law, Horatio would give them five shillings per week!

This, in Mr. Bottomley's opinion, will enable them to feed and clothe themselves. I should like to see Bottomley, Asquith & Co. doing it at the price. And what about rent?

In the following year Mr. Bottomley would extend the pensions to those of 65 years of age, thus bringing himself into line with those other advocates of "justice" for the squeezed-out workers, the Labour Party, who through Mr. G. N. Barnes, urged this proposal in the House of Commons in February, 1906.

In sending stamps for twelve months' subscription to THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, "Wrong Fount" expresses his appreciation of our efforts to produce an interesting and instructive journal, the reading of which has greatly strengthened him. He is a member of the S.D.F., and has been recently a municipal candidate for that body. He does not wish his name and town to be mentioned, as "the time has not yet arrived," whatever that may mean. He adds:—"You have a good work ahead; it is good if only for what the 'S.S.' has taught me, although I am still ashamed of my ignorance. Go on, Lads!"

Well, we cannot expect to dispel ignorance all at once. It took many years for some of us who were in the S.D.F. to arrive at the stage of entirely breaking away from the reform and palliative mongering of that body. But at last "the time arrived," and we formed the S.P.G.B.

One paragraph in "Wrong Fount's" letter is undoubtedly based upon an insufficient knowledge of the facts, and may also be due to some prejudice on his part against us. He says: "might I suggest that there is a vast difference between criticism and vilification—although I must confess that the latter weapon is not used so much now as it was formerly by you. That is good, too."

Now, I do not think it can be charged against us that we have ever vilified anyone in the columns of this journal. To vilify means to degrade by slander and a slander is a false or malicious report. So far as we know, no "slanders" have ever appeared and every effort will be made to keep them out. Upon reconsideration "Wrong Fount" will no doubt withdraw his remark.

On Wednesday, September 6th, 1905 (one year and eight months ago), whilst the Trade Union Congress was sitting at Hanley, over a hundred people were evicted during a heavy downpour of rain from their homes at New Hemsworth, near Barnsley, at the instance of the Colliery Company, with whom they were in dispute. Other evictions followed later. The dispute is not yet settled, and the evicted ones have not yet returned to "their" homes. They are endeavouring to subsist on the few shillings that can be raised by making charitable appeals to their fellow members of the working class, who have not sufficient for themselves.

For fourteen months out of the twenty there has been a "Labour" Party in the House of Commons, specially claiming to represent the Trade Unionists, of whom the Hemsworth colliers form a part. While the colliers and their wives and children have been suffering and starving, the "Labour" Party have been earning the enormous sums of the capitalist party, and boasting of their "sensitivity, adaptability, and respectability." One of them (Ramsay MacDonald) moved the adjournment of the House to discuss the shooting of natives in Natal, but none (not even W. Thorne, S.D.F.) has risked his reputation for "sensitivity, adaptability, and respectability" by denouncing the damnable system which produces such outrages as the Hemsworth evictions.

"Wrong Fount" may accuse me of vilification, but can he deny that what I have written is true and justifiable?

Of course one can quite understand the reluctance of Keir Hardie and his friends to take action concerning such a glaring illustration of that class war which they declare is only a "shibboleth" and "a reactionary and whiggish precept, certain to lead the movement away from the real aims of Socialism."

A formal report has been issued by the Departmental Committee appointed to inquire into the "probable economic effect of a limit of eight hours to the working day of coal mines." Some interesting evidence has been given, particularly as to the effect of a reduction in other industries. Mr. H. F. Donaldson, M.L.C.E., chief superintendent of the Ordnance Factories, Woolwich, detailed how the hours in the factories had been reduced from 54 to 48. Their method of work was really piecework, and the production had been approximately the same as under the old regime. The attendance of the men had been more regular since the shortening of the hours. He did not think that the reduction had meant an increased intensity of labour, but it did mean "hustle."

Mr. J. Lowrie, manager of the Royal Army Clothing Factory, Grosvenor Road, also gave evidence. He said that at his establishment there were employed 1,532 women and girls, of whom 1,385 were on piece work. Until 1894 they were working 55 hours per week, after which year they were reduced to 48. He did not think this reduction of seven hours had made any difference in the output: there was the same efficiency in the shorter hours. He considered it had been an economic success.

And there are some folks who talk of dealing with the unemployed problem by enacting an Eight Hours Day!

ON CO-OPERATORS AND "DIVI."

THE "In Focus" paragraphist of the Co-operators monthly, *The Wheat-sheaf*, deplores in the March issue the fact that "Some co-operators care nothing about beauty and fragrance and expansion of life" which, it seems, are as nothing beside a "divi." "What" he goes on deprecatingly "if quality is reduced or prices advanced or wages kept low or depreciations and reserve funds neglected, or stocks inflated or expenses carried forward, or educational committees thwarted, or the poor kept out of the movement? 'dazzling divi' makes amends for all."

Why, certainly. If the *Wheat-sheaf* writer thought to find it otherwise he is very much out of focus. What does he suppose co-operators take up their shares for? "beauty and fragrance and expansion of life"? Not much—not that, unless "beauty and fragrance and expansion of life" are secured for the individual co-operators through their dividends. They are in the business for precisely the same reason that the shareholder is in any other joint-stock concern—for what they can get out of it.

If it were asserted that 99 per cent. of co-operators were such first and foremost for dividends, it would probably be an understatement. I am not, of course, concerned to deny that "beauty and fragrance" and a few other odds and ends are tucked away in the lumber room of their co-operative being. And I doubt not that upon show days the contemplation of these musty virtues and worn-out ideals is most grateful and comforting. But that any of these qualities enter into the effective every-day calculations of the average co-operator no one who knows the average co-operator on his every-day side will be prepared to assert.

What is the attraction held out by the average society—by every society of my knowledge—to induce outsiders to take up shares? High dividends. What the bait in which the hook is imbedded? Large profits. What is the virtue extolled above all other virtues by the great men of the co-operative movement like Holyoake? Self-help and thrift and a house of your own out of the profits of the store, and so on. In the circumstances the really surprising thing to me

is that anybody professing knowledge of the real inwardness of the movement should give expression to such hopelessly antiquated views as those of the "In Focus" writer.

I say hopelessly antiquated because at one time it was the correct thing to emphasize the idealistic side of the movement. But that was many moons ago. To-day co-operation is frankly a business, and the only ideal known to business is larger profits. Of course there is nothing against the "co-op" working its way to any success possible as a business, in the same way that any other capitalist concern works. The objection I raise is against the attempt of some of its apologists to cant about its moral effects as a progressive, enlightening, uplifting force as against the immoral effects of profit-mongering capitalism, while all the time they prate their societies are dangling "large profits" carrot-wise in front of the noses of the proletariat.

I suppose the soft and gentle co-operator—if he is very soft—believes that there is some special virtue in his business which relieves his "divi" of the coarse and vulgar stigma of robbery which attaches to all other forms of profit. I suppose it is inconceivable to him that his quarterly or annual "share-out" is derived from precisely that same method of exploitation of the working-class producer which he deplores on special occasions with such lachrymose lamentation. I suppose he lays the flattering unction to his soul that the mere fact of being employed in the elevating atmosphere of a co-operative store is sufficient compensation for the happy shop assistant he employs, whose conditions in other respects differ in no material degree from those of most other shop-assistants. Or is it because our co-operator has to pay in excess of outside prices for so many things of inferior quality that he thinks he has made sufficient sacrifice for the movement, and cannot be expected to pay high wages or provide better conditions, particularly when his employees are receiving as good a wage as he (the co-operator) is himself getting from his own capitalist employer.

However that may be, the outstanding fact remains that the co-operative movement is a business dependent for its success upon its ability to enter the capitalist arena in effective competition with capitalist undertakings for trade. It may provide for the workers employed slightly better conditions in some respects than obtain in some other capitalist concerns. But it will do this, as capitalist Cadbury has done it, primarily because it has been shown to pay and only afterwards, and only then *perhaps*, for the sake of "beauty and fragrance and expansion of life." But it will always, because it must, maintain its essentially capitalist basis—there is no such thing as a Socialistic oasis in a capitalistic desert. Its dividends will always represent labour exploitation—there is no such thing as profits dissociated from robbery. And although perchance it may exude a little something recognisable to its members as "beauty and fragrance and expansion of life," there is no hope in it at all for the working-class until they have attained that level of mental development by which alone they will be able to appreciate their position and their power and give expression to that appreciation by taking over in their own interests as producers the whole of the means by which they are able to create and distribute the wealth of the world.

To that end it is merely folly to allege present day co-operative societies contribute. All they do is to bring into existence a class of petty capitalists whose interests as such, clashing with their interests as members of the working class, must tend to maintain that condition of muddled thought upon which the continued domination of the capitalist absolutely depends. For the reasons, therefore, (1) that the co-operative movement enlists its membership largely from the wage-earning class upon an anti-working class appeal; because (2) the ignorance manifested in the response is, so far as possible, maintained inside the movement; because (3) working-class ignorance is the one barrier which we as a Socialist party have to break down before we, in common with the rest of our class, can move forward to our freedom; for briefly these three reasons we are and must always be opposed to the co-operative movement.

AGRA.

WATFORD WOBBLERS!

THE article by Comrade F. Hesley in the last issue is to the point. It serves to emphasise statements we have often made in our local reports as to the condition of inextricable muddle and (to us) transparent make-believe in which our local opponents are floundering.

Such opponents! List to the initials of some of the organisations in which they are enrolled: S.D.F., I.L.P., F.S., L.R.C., L.C., T. & L.C., S. & L.E.C., L.L., W. & D.P.A., W.H. & H.C. I fear I have only given a few. But omissions are pardonable. They grow so rapidly. This week's list will probably be incomplete next week.

They are all engaged in setting the working-class house in order, these opponents. And all of them have different notions of the way to do it. Because all of them have different ideas as to what the disorder is. Therefore it is hardly surprising if the working-class house remains untidy. Is it?

But all of them have a common epithet for use against us. It is an epithet coined by their leaders to cover their lack of argument. It is their only argument against us. It is—impossibilist!

When we say, "dear friends, you are on the wrong track," they say—impossibilists! When we offer to prove they are making a confusion and calling it an order, they reply—impossibilists! When we urge them to consider a more excellent way they cry out upon us—impossibilists!

It is the common tie that binds them together. Yet they are not grateful to us for providing them with it. Quite the contrary. I suppose they feel that it isn't a very strong argument after all.

Hesley has reported the muddle at Hyndman's meeting. He has indicated the confusion into which a simple question can throw them. This doesn't surprise me. I know 'em. I'm only surprised that they didn't call him "impossibilist." Perhaps they were so confused that they couldn't even think of that.

Let me augment Hesley's article by a further instance. This time it will be a case indicative of our opponents' high standard of veracity. Or perhaps it is only a low standard of memory. The reader can judge.

Writing in the *Watford Critic* for April, G.T.H.K. refers to the results of the recent Urban District Council Elections thus: "Remember this is the first occasion of a Socialist candidature for the Urban District Council in either of these wards. Both Mr. Drew and Mr. Judge in the King's Ward . . . ran as plain Labour candidates last year without mention of Socialism."

Notice that "is." The italics belong to G.T.H.K. He is quite certain about it. This is the first time.

And observe the Misterters. They make assurance doubly sure. They were not Socialist candidates. Therefore they are not Comrades Drew and Judge. Only Misterters. Surely this is the first time.

Let us see. And remember that the *Watford Critic* is the local organ of the S.D.F.

This is from the *Critic* for March, 1906: "King's Ward will be contested in the interests of Labour by two of its finest exponents. . . . They are consciously working hard and continuously in the sacred name of a down-trodden humanity. In this they have a fixed purpose and will be no trimmers."

On this I will ask two questions. Can any but Socialists be among the finest exponents of the interests of Labour? Can any but Socialists work hard for down-trodden humanity without, consciously or unconsciously, trimming? I pause for G.T.H.K.'s reply.

The *Critic* again. April, 1906: Drew and Judge "are avowed Socialists and members of a militant Socialist organisation—the I.L.P."

Now G.T.H.K. Is that true? If so, this is not the first occasion of a "Socialist" candidature. If not, where were you last year to allow the statement to pass unrepudiated?

Shall I tell you where you were? You were organising the election work of Drew and Judge. You, a member of the S.D.F. then, as now! And you were introducing your comrades Drew and Judge at a public meeting as two able expon-

ents of Socialism whom you were very happy to support!

Now, what's your game? Yes! yes! I know I'm an "impossibilist," but what's your game? Is it that you want to obscure the fact that as compared with last year's results your party's candidates were this year snowed under? Or what?

Is your point that although Judge and Drew were Socialists they did not run as such? If so you stand confessed as the champion of fraudulent candidatures. And if your present view is that such candidatures are wrong and harmful, why are you associated with an organisation that is to-day working with the parties responsible for such candidatures?

I pause for some more replies. When I get them I shall have a little more to say. If I don't get them I may still have a little more to say. And I think G.T.H.K. will be interested in that little more.

Anyhow, this is the local position. It is synchronised in the case cited. A condition of mess, muddle, and make-believe. Of paltering piffle and prevarication. Of contortion and confusion confounded.

And when we say this sort of thing is stupid and stultifying we are "impossibilists." When we say that in a multitude of organisations there is no virtue, we are "impossibilists." When we say the truth must be spoken and not burked or blinked, we are "impossibilists." When we say that Socialism is the only remedy for working-class ills, that to advocate less at any time is futile and disappointing and dangerous, we are "impossibilists."

Well! well! we are the "impossibilists." The S.D.F., I.L.P., F.S., etc., etc., etc. *ad nauseum* are the "possibilists." So must it be. But I should like to hear G.T.H.K.'s explanations. I'm sure they would be helpful.

B.R.

THE CENTURY OF CAPITALISM.

WHAT THE NINETEENTH CENTURY STOOD FOR.

THE nineteenth century was the century of capitalism. Capitalism filled that century to overflowing with its commerce, its industry, its manners, its fashions, its literature, its arts, its science, its philosophy, its religion, its politics and its civil code, more universal than the laws imposed by Rome upon the nations of the ancient world. The capitalist movement, starting from England, the United States, and France, has shaken the foundations of Europe and of the world. It has forced the old feudal monarchies of Austria and Germany and the barbaric despotism of Russia to put themselves in line; and in these last days it has gone into the extreme east, into Japan, where it has overthrown the feudal system and implanted the industry and the politics of capitalism.

Capitalism has taken possession of our planet; its fleets bring together the continents which oceans had separated; its railroads, spanning mountains and deserts, furrow the earth, the electric wires, the nervous system of the globe, bind all nations together, and their palpitations reverberate in the great centres of population. Now for the first time there is a contemporary history of the world. Events in Australia, the Transvaal, China, are known in London, Paris, New York at the moment they are brought about precisely as if they happened in the outskirts of the city where the news is published.

Civilised nations live off the products of the whole earth. Egypt, India, Louisiana, furnish the cotton, Australia the wool, Japan the silk, China the tea, Brazil coffee, New Zealand and the United States the meat and grain. The capitalist carries in his stomach and on his back the spoils of the universe.

The study of natural phenomena has undergone an unprecedented, an unheard of development. New sciences, geology, chemistry, physics, etc., have arisen. The industrial application of the forces of nature and of the discoveries of science has taken on a still more startling development; some of the geometrical discoveries of the scientists of Alexandria, two thousand years old, have for the first time been utilised.

The production of machine industry can provide for all demand and more. The mechanical application of the forces of nature has increased man's productive forces tenfold, a hundredfold. A few hours' daily labor, furnished by the able-bodied members of the community, would produce enough to satisfy the material and intellectual needs of all.

But what has come of the colossal and wonderful development of science, industry and commerce in the nineteenth century? Has it made humanity stronger, healthier, happier? Has it given leisure to the producers? Has it brought comfort and contentment to the people?

Never has work been so prolonged, so exhausting, so injurious to man's body and so fatal to his intelligence. Never has the industrial labor which undermines health, shortens life and starves the intellect been so general, been imposed on such ever-growing masses of laborers. The men, women and children of the proletariat are bent under the iron yoke of machine industry. Poverty is their reward when they work, starvation when they lose their jobs.

In former stages of society, famine appeared only when the earth refused her harvests. In capitalist society, famine sits at the hearth of the working class when granaries and cellars burst with the fruits of the earth, and when the market is gorged with the products of industry.

All the toil, all the production, all the suffering of the working class has but served to heighten its physical and mental destitution, to drag it down from poverty into wretchedness.

Capitalism, controlling the means of production and directing the social and political life of a century of science and industry, has become bankrupt. The capitalists have not even proved competent, like the owners of chattel slaves, to guarantee to their toilers the work to provide their miserable livelihood; capitalism massacred them when they dared demand the right to work—a slave's right.

The capitalist class has also made a failure of itself. It has seized upon the social wealth to enjoy it, and never was ruling class more incapable of enjoyment. The newly-rich, those who have built up their fortunes by accumulating the filchings from labour, live expatriated in the midst of luxury and artistic treasures, with which they surround themselves through a foolish vanity, to pay homage to their millions.

The leading capitalists, the millionaires and billionaires, are sad specimens of the human race, useless and hurtful. The mark of degeneracy is upon them. Their sickly offspring are old at birth. Their organs are sapped with diseases. Exquisite meat and wines load down their tables, but the stomach refuses to digest them; women expert in love perfume their couches with youth and beauty, but their senses are benumbed. They own palatial dwellings on enchanting sites, and they have no eyes, no feeling for joyful nature, with its eternal youth and change. Sated and disgusted with everything, they are followed everywhere with ennui as by their shadows. They yawn at rising and when they go to bed; they yawn at their feasts and at their orgies. They began yawning in their mother's womb.

The pessimism which, in the wake of capitalist property, made its appearance in ancient Greece six centuries before Jesus Christ, and which has since formed the foundation of the moral and religious philosophy of the capitalist class, became the leading characteristic of the philosophy of the second half of the nineteenth century. The pessimism of Theognis sprang from the uncertainties and vicissitudes of life in the Greek cities, torn by the perpetual wars between rich and poor; the pessimism of the capitalist is the bitter fruit of satiety, ennui and the impoverishment of the blood.

Capitalism, bankrupt, old, useless and hurtful, has finished its historic mission; it persists as ruling class only through its acquired momentum. The proletariat of the twentieth century will execute the decree of history; will drive it from its position of social control. Then the stupendous work in science and industry accomplished by civilised humanity, at the price of such toil and suffering, will engender peace and happiness; then will this vale of tears be transformed into an earthly paradise.

PAUL LAFARGE in the *Socialist Herald*, Milwaukee.

THE PREMIER RAILWAY SYSTEM AND THOSE WHO WORK IT.

A FEW instructive extracts are given by the *Paris Herald* from an article by Hector Macfarlane in a recent number of the *Railway Magazine* upon the L. & N.W. Railway whose greatness as "the Premier line" we are called upon to join with the author in eulogizing, and whose stupendous wages bill it seems to be expected we shall contemplate "in wonder and amaze." The income of this company for the year of grace 1906 was considerably in excess of £15,000,000 and it is anticipated that the present ideal of £20,000,000 will be realised within a few years.

Of this £15,000,000 no less a sum than £5,300,000 was paid in salaries and wages. This amount includes the salary of the General Manager who, it is alleged, is in receipt of the fairly adequate "dot" of £7,000 per annum. Of course all the members of the staff are not remunerated upon the same generous scale—quite. A number only receive £3,000 or £2,000, and even £1,000 and less is well within the experience of a considerable number. In fact, according to an examination made by the *Railway Review* it would appear that there are some in receipt of less than £53 per annum seeing that £53 is the average which the *Railway Review* informs us the total wages bill works out to per head. But then it must not be overlooked that every one of these something less-than-a-pound-a-weekers, have by the exercise of thrift and temperance and whole-souled concentration upon the business of the Company, an opportunity (nearly free and moderately unfettered) of rising to the position of General Manager at £7,000 a year—general managers being always products of such exercises! And if they don't seize their opportunities they have no one to blame but themselves.

But even if it be objected that as there is only one manager, the odds against the aspirant for managerial position are, as that anti-betting organ, the *Daily News* would say, somewhat "long," there is always the unanswerable retort that these bottom dogs have the gratification of knowing that they are working for "the Premier line of Great Britain"—absolutely the only Premier line in this happy island. No employee of any other line can say as much or nearly as much. The solace which the L. & N.W.R. submerged tenth must derive from that reflection when the baby wants new shoes and Johnny's trousers refuse to stand another patch, and the bread-and-dripping diet begins to pall, must be inculcable—worth another pound a week (or thereabouts) at least.

But Mr. Macfarlane has more information for us. The debenture holders, it appears, draw £1,000,000 per annum as their share of the proceeds of the work they don't do, while preference, guaranteed, and ordinary stockholders annex a matter of £5,000,000 in return for their kindness in providing the means for the working of the Premier transit system. In view of the fact that many of these have probably never seen the great company in action (indubitably an inestimable loss to them) it will be readily agreed, and by none more readily than the less-than-a-pound-a-weekers who merely do the work of the line, that the stockholders' annual share of the income estimated by the *Railway Review* as representing an average of a paltry £73 per head per annum, is by no means excessive.

FILIUS POPULI.

A Board of Trade return gives the number of persons killed on railways in the United Kingdom last year in course of public traffic as 1,169. Of these 166 were passengers, 438 servants of companies or contractors, the remainder trespassers, suicides and persons passing over level crossings. The number injured during the year was 7,201. In addition 45 servants and 28 other persons were killed, and 13,211 people injured upon railway companies' premises, but in which the movement of vehicles used exclusively upon railways was not concerned.

PARTY NOTES.

This month the open-air propaganda commences in real earnest for the season. A Lecture List appears on the back page, but this does not include the week-night meetings, of which most branches are holding two or three each week.

I have to announce another change in the address of the Head Office. After May 1st it will be located at 22, Great James St., Bedford Row, London, W.C. The removal is another sign of our continued progress.

When the Party was formed its postal address was the Communist Club, 107, Charlotte St., W. There our letters were received and we held our Executive Meetings. But we had no proper office, and the business of the Party was conducted by its various officials at addresses as wide asunder as Ilford and Watford, Tottenham and Tooting. Later we took an office at 1a, Caledonian Road, which was somewhat inconvenient for South London members, and where we were not permitted to exhibit our name at the front door. Afterwards we removed to a larger and more central office at 28, Curstorf St., and now we are installed at 22, Great James Street.

Each succeeding change involved a greater expense, but the growth of the Party enabled us to meet it. Our new office is larger and more comfortable, also better ventilated than any of the preceding ones, but it is still more expensive. However, we have signed an agreement for twelve months certain, and have no doubt that all members, when they view it, will appreciate the change and redouble their efforts for the Party, to enable the additional cost to be met.

The Economic and Speakers' Classes will continue at the new address. The former will be held on May 9 and alternate Thursdays at 8 p.m. J. Fitzgerald is the conductor. The Speakers' Class will be held on May 16 and alternate Thursdays, under the guidance of J. Kent. All comrades are invited to these classes.

J. A. Lain has been expelled by the Tottenham Branch, for voting for a Mr. Broadbent, a nondescript candidate, once a member of the S.D.F., at a recent election.

The West Ham Branch have broken out on new ground, having commenced meetings in South West Ham, the stronghold of Mr. Will Thorne, M.P. More power to their elbow.

R. H. Kent and F. E. Hawkins visited Nottingham on April 7th. The weather was very unfavourable, but they held a meeting and sold a good quantity of *SOCIALIST STANDARDS*.

Romford Division Branch are tackling some new districts. They cordially invite those who have regularly attended their meetings during the past season to "screw up" their courage to the sticking point and join the Party. The S.P.G.B. Club has removed, owing to expiration of lease, from 43 to 39, York Road, Ilford, and new members will be welcomed.

The Batterssea Branch is forging ahead. The premises having been sold they were compelled to give up Sydney Hall, but soon found other suitable quarters.

Copies of the photograph taken at the recent Annual Conference can now be had from Head Office, 22, Great James Street, Bedford Row, W.C., at nine pence each. Postage two pence extra.

Order THE SOCIALIST STANDARD through your local newsagent. If you have any difficulty in obtaining it regularly please communicate with the S.P.G.B., 22, Great James St., London, W.C.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

HEAD OFFICE:

22, GREAT JAMES STREET, LONDON, W.C.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—A. Jones, Secretary, 3, Mathew St., Latchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at S.P.G.B., Laburnum House, 134, High Street, Battersea, S.W. Club open every evening.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Executive Committee. Applications should be sent to the General Secretary.

EAST HAM.—W. Gifford, Sec., 31, Maryland Square, Stratford. Branch meets Mondays at 7.30 a. 447, Katherine Rd., Forest Gate.

EDMONTON.—Sidney Auty, Sec. 60, Gilpin Grove, Edmonton. Branch meets Wednesdays 8.30.

FULHAM.—J. Humphries, Secretary, 309, North End Rd. Branch meets Feb. 15 and alternate Fridays at 8.30, at Ingram's Coffee Tavern, Fulham Cross.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Fri. at 8.30 at 79, Grove Rd., Holloway. Communications to the Sec.

PADDINGTON.—Communications to Sec. c/o S. Linfield, 81, Fernhead Road, Maida Hill, W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at Harley's Coffee Tavern (foot of Lock Bridge), Harrow Road.

PECKHAM.—W. Wren, Sec., 91, Evelina Rd., Nunhead, S.E. Branch meets every Wed. at 8.30

ROMFORD DIVISION.—All communications to the Secretary, S.P.G.B. Club, 39, York Road, Ilford. Branch meets Mondays at 8 at Club.

TOOTING.—P. Dumenil, Secretary, 36, Byton Road Tooting, S.W. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. at Goringe Dining Rooms, Goringe Park Parade, Tooting Junction.

TOTTENHAM.—T. Lobb, Sec. Branch meets Mon. 8 at p.m., at Sunbeam Coffee Tavern, High Rd.

WATFORD.—T. Wilkins, Sec., 4, Marlborough Rd. Branch meets alternate Fridays at 8 p.m.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Mondays 7.30, followed at 8.30 by discussion, at 447, Katherine Road, Forest Gate.

WOOD GREEN.—H. Crump, Secretary, 39, Hermitage Road, Harringay, N. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Sundays at 3.30.

WOOLWICH & PLUMSTEAD.—A. E. Rance, Sec., 71a, Marmadon Rd., Plumstead. Branch meets on 2nd and 4th Wednesdays in month at 8.30, Conway Road, Plumstead.

INFORMATION

concerning the Party can be obtained of the following
BIRMINGHAM.—H. Oldknow, 227, St. Saviour's

Road, Saltley.

BRADFORD (Yorks).—Ben Wilde, 78, Godwin St.
BURTON-ON-TRENT.—J. Blundell, 157, New St.
LIVERPOOL.—J. M. O. Sullivan, 4, Laburnum Grove, Litherland.
MANCHESTER.—J. Marsh, 97, Blantyre Street, Swinton, Nr. Manchester.

WHOLESALE AGENTS

FOR

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD.

HENDERSON, 16, Paternoster Row, E.C.
JOHN HEYWOOD, Ltd., Deansgate, Manchester, and Lamb's Conduit St., London.
W. H. SMITH & SON, Blackfriars St., Manchester.
J. NAYLOR & Co., 147 & 149, Gt. Junction Street, Leith.

RETAIL AGENTS.

JACQUES, 191, Old Street, E.C.
SMITH (late Manners), 47, Fetter Lane, E.C.
VESPERMAN, 251, Gray's Inn Road, W.C.
WREN, 91, Evelina Road, Nunhead, S.E.
ROOK, 9a, Cursitor Street, E.C.
GRANT, Ilford Hill, Ilford.
SIMPSON, 209, Leytonstone Road, Stratford, E.
BREWSTER, 153, Barking Rd., Canning Town.
WARNE, 1a, Queen's Square, Upton Park, E.
MENHINICK, 40, King William St., London B'dge.
FOX, 18a, New Kent Road, S.E.
BURKE, 35, Ford Street, Bow, E.
LIBRAIRE COSMOPOLITE, 56, Charlotte Street, London, W.
NEWLANE, 18, High Street, Camden Town.
Miss DICKENSON, 96, Laureston St., Edinburgh.
E. WALLACE, 73, Fountainbridge, Edinburgh.
P. MACINNES, 3, West Nicolson St., Edinburgh.
GEDD, 181, Dalry Road, Edinburgh.
SHELLEY BOOK AGENCY, Gloucester Street, Oxford.
H. RUBIN, 13, Cottenham St., Westgate Hill, Newcastle-on-Tyne.
E. G. SMITH, 126, Tunnel Road, Liverpool.
ASHWORTH, 170, London Road, Manchester.
N. MELLINSKY, 34, Meanwood Rd., Leeds.
A. POLLOCK, 18, Richardson St., Halifax.
W. K. LIGGATT, 27, Stevenson St., Calton, Glasgow.
L. MACARTNEY, 181, Overgate, Dundee.
LEWIS, Wood Street, Walthamstow.
McPHEELY, 33, London Road, Glasgow.
LOGAN, 1, Macfurlane St., Gallowgate, Glasgow.
HIGGINS, 52, Argyle St., Anderston, Glasgow.
MARTIN, 368, Govan St., S.S. Glasgow.
HUNTER, 151, Main St., Gorbals, Glasgow.
McDONALD, 203, Castle St., Townhead, Glasgow.
NAYLOR, 177b, Gt. Junction St., Leith.
NAYLOR, 1a, Bowling Green St., Leith.

THE

SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

HOLDS

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master-class, and the consequent enslavement of the working-class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working-class from the domination of the master-class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working-class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist-class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working-class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working-class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master-class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

S.P.G.B. LECTURE LIST. MAY, 1907.

SUNDAYS.	5th.	12th.	19th.	26th.
Battersea, Prince's Head	11.30 E. Fairbrother	T. W. Allen	R. H. Kent	J. Fitzgerald
Canning Town, Beckton Rd.	7.30 Fawcett & Roe	Barker, McManus	E. Fairbrother	J. Fitzgerald
Finsbury Park	7.30 W. Gifford	H. C. Phillips	F. E. Dawkins	J. Kent
Fulham, Broughton Road	3.30 A. Anderson	J. Fitzgerald	F. C. Watts	E. Dawkins
Ilford, Loxford Bridge	7.30 E. Fairbrother	W. A. Cole	Barker, McManus	H. Newman
Jolly Butchers' Hill	7.30 J. Kent	F. E. Dawkins	W. A. Cole	H. C. Phillips
Manor Park Broadway	11.30 F. E. Dawkins	R. H. Kent	A. Anderson	W. Gifford
Paddington, Prince of Wales	7.30 J. Crump	J. Fitzgerald	H. C. Phillips	T. W. Allen
Plaistow, Green Gate	11.30 J. Kent	W. A. Cole	F. E. Dawkins	A. Anderson
Tooting Broadway	11.30 F. C. Watts	H. Newman	T. W. Allen	E. Fairbrother
Tottenham, West Green Rd.	11.30 W. A. Cole	F. E. Dawkins	J. Kent	W. A. Cole
Watford Market Place	7.30 Barker, McManus	E. Fairbrother	H. Newman	Fawcett & Roe
	11.30 T. W. Allen	A. Anderson	J. Fitzgerald	F. E. Dawkins
	8.0 A. Anderson	A. Anderson	A. Anderson	A. Anderson
	7.30 F. S. Leigh	T. W. Allen	J. Fitzgerald	W. A. Cole

BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, &c. to be obtained of the S.P.G.B., 22, Great James St., London, E.C.

CAPITAL (Karl Marx) ... 5s. 6d.

SIX CENTURIES OF WORK AND WAGES (Thorold Rogers) ... 5s. 6d.

POVERTY (Rowntree) ... 4s. 6d.

SOCIALIST STANDARD
Vols. I. & II (Bound) each 3s. 0d.

MANIFESTO and RULES of the S.P.G.B. ... 1½d.

FROM HANDICRAFT TO CAPITALISM (Kautsky) 1½d.

COMMUNIST MANIFESTO ... 2½d.

WAGE LABOUR & CAPITAL (Marx) 1½d.

JONES' BOY ... 1½d.

SOCIALISM & THE WORKER (Sorge) 1½d.

HOW I BECAME A SOCIALIST (Morris) 1½d.

THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION (Kautsky) 7½d.

ALL POST FREE.

VOL. II

OF

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

(Sept., 1905 to Aug., 1906.)

Well bound in cloth, gold lettered,

Post Free ... 3s. 0d.

THE REWARD OF INTELLECT.

The Publishers' League, in a bulletin directed against the tariff on type-setting machines, reports that the Mergenthaler Linotype Co. has bought up over 600 patents, of which about 50 are used, the others being "locked up" for the purpose of perpetuating the Mergenthaler monopoly. Mergenthaler invented the machine. He died in poverty. The concern which "capitalized" and exploited the invention has become one of the strongest monopolies in America.

Labour (St. Louis).

NOW READY.

S.P.G.B. LIBRARY, No. 2.

From Handicraft to Capitalism,

Translated from the German of
KARL KAUTSKY.

The only translation in the English language of this important section of the famous "Das Erfurter Program."

POST FREE ... 1½d.
S.P.G.B., 22, Great James St., London, W.C.

The Head Office of The Socialist Party of Great Britain is at 22, Great James Street, London, W.C.

The
Official Organ
of
The
Socialist Party
of
Great Britain.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

No. 34. Vol. 3.]

LONDON, JUNE, 1907.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

THE MODERN TYRANNY.

Man's Dominion over Things

WHETHER it could ever have been truly said that man was "Lord of Creation," using the last word in its mundane sense, is a point the profit of discussing which may be doubted. But if we agree that there was some modicum of truth in the Scriptural statement that man had dominion over all "created" things, then indeed has he had such a fall from his position of universal ascendancy as even the historic experience of Humpty Dumpty does not parallel.

The rude savage, launching his arrow at the light-footed denizen of the plains, or contriving traps and pitfalls and poisoned welcome for the lumbering giants of the forest, might still, perhaps, be looked down upon with an air of condescension by the modern "Lord of Creation," whose bow has evolved into a rifle, and whose chemistry has advanced from poison to explosives.

But, low as we adjudge him in the scale of humanity, the savage's dominion over things had one distinguishing characteristic of vital importance, which made him a true dominator, and the absence of which has reduced civilised man, with all his vaunted triumphs over the forces of nature, to a condition of slavery more abject, more subtle, and more general than any form of subjection which has previously cumbered the earth.

This characteristic lay in man's relation to the simple tools and weapons which constituted his means of procuring the necessities of life. Early man was master of his instruments of production. He took up his bow when he was hungry or in danger, and laid it aside when it had served the logical purpose of its existence. He plied his axe, spun and wove on rude frames, and produced wealth by toilsome processes, to the end that he might have shelter and clothing and the comforts of his age, and these obtained, his axe might lie idle, and his loom be still.

And if, in these material things, the instruments of wealth production were the servants of those who made and owned and used them, still more effectively did they serve them in other ways. They lifted man up above the beasts of the field and gave him dominion over them. They brought him self-consciousness,—the tree of knowledge of good and evil. They built him up moral codes and ethical standards who had known no law of conduct. They prescribed his methods of life, determined his sexual relationships, fashioned alike the canons of his art and of his religion. They made unto him images to bow down to and worship—images of his idealised self, decked out in the barbaric splendour of savage virtues—"good"uns according to his lights."

The savage sustaining himself by the weapons of the chase and war esteems certain qualities as virtues which people whose means of production have evolved to a higher stage condemn as vices. Thus the bow and spear demand for courage and cunning and ferocity, recognition as the highest of virtues, and decree the merciful unworthy and contemptible, while the plough

and the windmill elevate the peaceful and the compassionate. Ferocity is a social necessity in savage life, as peace is to husbandry.

As also were his Gods.

So, the needs of Society as fashioned by the means of producing wealth, determine what shall be virtue and what vice, and the gods of the people being the embodiment of the people's ideal, we find those of the savage and nomad races to be mighty gods of war, merciless and pitiless—the god of the barbarous Jews of the Old Testament, who smote the Amalakites and the Egyptians, and bade his victorious people take their male captives and "put them under axes of iron and under harrows of iron, and pass them through brick-kilns," while for the virgins he devised a fate quite in accord with the jolly nature of one who said of Solomon (who numbered his wives by the hundred) "He is a man after my own heart." And we find the ever developing means of production mould the people's gods like plastic clay as they mould the people,—as they moulded the god of the Hebrews of the Old Testament into the loving and merciful father (an impossible conception to the savage) of the New.

In this way the tools—the means of producing wealth—served man in the past; served him with an irresistible hand if you like, and very much as a benevolent despot might serve his people, but served him nevertheless, since they developed in the individual, and set up in public esteem those qualities which were necessary to the public welfare.

But when we examine the relative position of man and his means of production we stand appalled at the changed condition.

But the tool has become master.

The servant has become the master. That which man conceived and created in order that he might use it to assist him in the production of wealth, now *uses man*, not in the production of wealth, but of profit. The savage bent his bow to procure him meat and clothing and shelter, but human productive activities have long ceased to be purposive of the feeding, clothing, sheltering and comforting of humanity. If bread was produced to feed the hungry we should not find plaster in part substituted for flour. If cloth was produced to clothe the naked we should not weight it with useless and harmful mineral substances. Our universal custom of adulteration should show those whom no other argument can convince, that our modern means of wealth production are only incidentally means of producing those things which are necessary to the life and well-being of the people, while they are purposely conceived and designed and created with the primary object of producing—profit.

Think of it, ye exultant admirers of the march of civilisation, this wonderful development of the productive powers of man, which has subjugated the lightning and exploited the tides, which has conquered the obdurate barrenness of the desert and set at defiance the terrors of capricious and untoward seasons, which has

taken the very earth in its grip and forced it to yield up its treasures willy-nilly, what of human advantage has it brought, with all its evolution and its revolution? What is it to us that it has made two blades of grass grow where one grew before, if we may never lie down upon it be we never so weary? What is it to us that the drought can no longer bring us famine or the storm destroy our crops, if from abundance we reap only stint and from very surfeit starvation? What is it to us that the cataract has been harnessed to our wheels and the electric element put to our revolving wonders, if we find no respite from toil save in utter exhaustion, and no relief from the cares of penury and insecurity but in the oblivion of the grave?

Yet this is what the development of our means of production has brought us to. It has made the fields to bring forth with astonishing prodigality, but it has created private ownership in those fields, and driven us from them, and brands us trespassers when we set foot upon their green sward.

It has made us independent of the seasons and secure from famine, but instead it has given us the terrors of plethora—the casting of producers into the streets to starve because they have produced too much. It has placed the mighty forces of water-power and steam and electricity at the disposal of man, to enable him to produce with economical expenditure of effort, yet, instead of lightening his toil, it has augmented it until it is limited only by his endurance, and instead of saving him from the insecurity and vicissitudes of life, it has extended them until he finds surcease only in his death.

What dignity may ever have attached to the human state has been crushed out under the fearful tyranny of modern machinery. Not only has man's productive energies been subverted so he labours for profit instead of for use-values,

And has reduced him to a Commodity.

but he himself is reduced to the status of a commodity, is driven to market with a price upon his head like the most vulgar of the inanimate objects which he produces for sale, there to struggle for recognition as a common use-value, to find a purchaser or to perish. And in the struggle he is undone by the child of his own bosom. His position is undermined and he is rendered increasingly superfluous by the very machinery which he has created and raised up in opposition to him.

Nor is it only the producer who lies trammelled beneath the modern tyrant. Just as much is the possessor under the lash, at least as regards the development of those finer qualities and feelings which the evolutionary processes have rendered socially expedient and therefore moral. Our means of production have set the individual in opposition to the community. No longer are those qualities which are good for Society those fostered by our economic relations. The purchaser of labour-power who allows himself to be actuated by humane feelings, who pays above the market price for the human flesh and blood which he incorporates in the commodities

he produces, or (which is the same thing) neglects to drain the last drop of sweat out of his workers, to just that extent weakens his position in the race for accumulated capital. To that extent he proves himself the unworthy steward of Capital, and Capital has a process of selection wonderfully effective in eliminating her unworthy stewards. She has no place for them in her economy—there is no room in production for profit for any humane feelings, but only for mean, sordid avarice and the qualities which support it. The capitalist even, dare not stand up and be a man; dare not if he would give free rein to the feelings which (perchance) surge up within his breast. He also is a servitor of the modern tyrant, compelled by irresistible economic forces to play his part in the grim tragedy, in which each must be either oppressed or oppressor.

So human nature itself writhes under the heel of the tyrant. The ferocity of the savage, fostered by his method of production, was good both for the individual and his tribe, but who can pretend that that avarice nourished by capitalist production, at the promptings of which, when a man asks for beer we give him arsenic, and when our soldiers at the "front" ask for food we somehow get the powder mixed up with the beef, and the can explodes as Tommy opens it—who can pretend, I ask, that the mean and sordid qualities which our capitalist system of production tends to develop are good

for the race, whatever they may be for the individual? The savage, so far from being ashamed of the ferocity and cunning which are nurtured by his method of obtaining subsistence, idealises them, and makes them the inherent qualities of his gods; but dare we so elevate and deify those personal attributes which tend to success in our mad system of blood-sucking competition? No, they are anti-social, and instinctively we condemn them, as the savage condemns as undoing weakness the feeling that would spare an enemy. They are base, and we hate, loathe and despise them, as we must all baseness, and try to cover them up with the veil of hypocrisy, and put them out of sight behind vain pretences.

The machinery then, which we have perfected with so much patient application, has not only increased our toil and decreased our security, driven us from the fields to the city slum, set us so in opposition one against another that the son must struggle with the father, and the mother snatch the bread from the mouth of her babe, but it has so taken hold of us and our lives that the very possession of the social qualities which alone are moral, are damnation to their possessors. It has dethroned us, not only from any position of "lordship" we may have had over "creation," but from that of being dictators of our own better feelings and guardians of those social instincts which play so important a part in our collective advancement.

A.E.J.

CORRESPONDENCE.

We do not hold ourselves responsible for opinions expressed by correspondents.

[To the Editor of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD.]

EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION.

Dear Comrade,—On Sunday evening last I heard a member of the I.L.P. refer to himself as an Evolutionary Socialist. At the moment he was leading up to the statement that the revolutionist position was not in harmony with the law of evolution. A revolutionist who was present, claimed that he also was an Evolutionary Socialist, and that evolution was the same thing as revolution.

As each man was an able exponent of his particular school of thought, and as I, at almost every Socialist meeting I attend, am brought face to face with differences, all primarily hinging upon this subject, I am more convinced than ever that the relative value of the terms, evolution and revolution, is not even approximately apprehended by those who use them most. I, therefore, ask your permission to be again allowed to express in the STANDARD my views on the subject.

All Socialists contend that revolution is part and parcel of the evolutionary process, the meaning of their contention being that revolution is part and parcel of the evolutionary process it eventually supercedes. Here they become involved in a glaring absurdity, and in consequence great confusion arises.

Revolution being regarded as part and parcel of the evolutionary process in which he is interested, the Evolutionary Socialist believes that the former can be grafted on to the latter a bit at a time. If the above premiss were correct, the reasoning would be sound, for if the two terms mean the same thing, the one would merge into the other by a gradual and regular process, like a boy evolving to manhood; the boy being always the potential man.

The Revolutionary Socialist believes that revolution must be applied at one set time, and he is right; but he does not appear to know how he is right or where he is right, and so long as he holds the aforesaid premiss to be true, he never will know.

Now let us to the subject. On examination we find that the law of evolution is universal. Every single thing in nature, whether organic or inorganic, whether it be a substance or a quality, evolves; but each evolves from its own specific base, so representing a distinct phase of the law which governs it.

Revolution is no exception to this rule; it evolves, but that does not constitute it an integral part of evolution any more than growth makes an animal, a plant or a planet an integral part of it. The law is superior to each.

Revolutions in Society are the effect, like all other effects, of a dual causation—in this case, social conditions on the one hand, man on the other. Man evolves under one phase of the law of evolution, his social conditions under another. The interaction of these two phases stands as the positive and negative causes to a third, which we distinguish by the word revolution.

Revolutions, then, are the result of two opposing forces, one not evolving from the other, but each growing from a separate base within Society. One of these forces is now evolving as an established fact from a set social foundation; the other, though itself subject to the common law of evolution, yet represents a different and hostile phase of that law; and again, to distinguish it from the phase at present in active and practical operation, we call it revolution.

The recognition of the class struggle clearly demonstrates the truth of the foregoing. The evolutionary phase in actual social operation is represented by the capitalist class, the evolutionary phase, which is still a theory—revolution—is represented by the working class. Each of these phases of evolution has its base in an opposing interest, and each, therefore, must be in hostility to the other. That the conflict of these two forces will finally lead to harmony of interest in Society, does not prove that the working-class interest has evolved from the capitalist interest—the capitalist system—for, from the outset, they have been in deadly antagonism, and therefore must have evolved from different bases.

All changes in Society are brought about by the interaction of man and his environment. The social conditions prompt man's thought, the thought evolves as a theory until the idea stands clothed in its palpable, material form. This embodiment stands in turn as the stimulating impulse to further advance.

Similarly, the theory of Socialism, prompted and sustained by social conditions, is evolving—not with revolution as its objective, for it already stands as revolution in the process of evolution—but towards its final consummation; the day when the theory will have become the established fact.

The revolutionary forces at work within capitalist society must eventually evolve to the point of upheaval. The result will be the downfall of capitalism and the consequent exhaustion of the forces which have destroyed it. Having accomplished its mission, revolution disappears and the new system starts to grow, not from a revolutionary base, but from an evolutionary base. That is to say, the antagonistic phases of evolution having performed their functions, die out, and there arises from the expended energies of both a new form of evolution—a new species, as it were.

Socialism, then, will not have evolved from capitalism, nor from the revolutionary forces now at work against capitalism, but it will start a new and distinct form of evolution, which has

been produced by the meeting and mutual destruction of the two hostile forces. A new base has been established which can be changed only by another revolution.

This creation of a new evolutionary base is the function of revolution in the evolutionary process, whether in Society or in the broad domain of nature. Revolution grows slowly but acts quickly. When fully developed, and only then, it grapples with its enemy, conquers, and in the effort, dies.

Nothing else is a revolution in the Socialist sense. A Social Revolution means a revolution in the social base, not a change in the upper structure; and such a revolution has never occurred since private ownership in the means of life was dropped in its adamant setting ages ago.

And now, having, as I hope, made fairly clear the view I hold of the vital difference between the two evolutionary forces under discussion, I should like to lay down a few general propositions in regard thereto.

Nothing in nature evolves to a base; everything evolves from a base, and must for ever go on evolving from that base unless it is changed or destroyed by revolution, this force being a counter phase of the general evolutionary process, and one which has evolved from a base hostile to the one it displaces.

It is a law of nature that like evolves like; that is, anything which evolves from another thing must of necessity perpetuate the basic characteristics of the thing from which it evolved. Socialism will have none of the basic characteristics of capitalism; therefore, it is unscientific to contend that it will evolve from capitalism.

No system of society can evolve from another system of society unless they both grow from the same base. To change the base requires the aid of revolution. In producing the change, revolution not only destroys that which it opposes, but itself also; a new form of evolution springing as an effect from the juxtaposition and destruction of the two causes.

The revolution which the Evolutionary Socialists claim to be their objective may be brought nearer a bit at a time, but that bit at a time must consist of the education of individual members of the working class. That is, they must try to hasten the evolution of the revolutionary forces, not waste their time trying to palliate the phase of evolution to which they are opposed. That stands upon its own base and can look after itself. It can and will evolve the necessary palliatives and reforms when conditions are ripe, and not before. To ripen conditions, help along the revolutionary principle; the opposing conditions ripen fast enough.

To aim chunks of so-called revolution at capitalism and expect to see it fall, is about as wise a proceeding as trying to measure the moon for a suit of clothes. The problem of the Socialist is how to make revolutionists, not how to evolve capitalism into Socialism. That, I again assert, can never be done while the word retains its present meaning, and to the best of my ability I am prepared to defend that assertion against anyone who cares to dispute it. I should most heartily welcome the attention of an evolutionary Socialist.

Yours fraternally,
H. PHILIPOTT WRIGHT.

ISLINGTON BRANCH REPORT.

Sunday, May 5th, the 89th anniversary of the birth of Karl Marx, proving a favourable opportunity, we opened our season by setting up our platform in the midst of a number of orators of all shades of opinion. In front was an open-air Sunday School; close by a Christian Evidence man denounced the Secularists, while adjacent a Secularist denounced the Christians. A Free-Trader disputed with a Protectionist whether the workers were better off under Liberal or Tory rule, and mystified the audience. Comrade Anderson pointed out the true inwardness of the situation to an attentive gathering, and finished amidst applause. We sold 70 STANDARDS, and had a good collection. Altogether a promising start. We hope, by the time this report appears, to have started our Wednesday night propaganda meetings at Highbury Corner.

H.A.Y.

PARTY NOTES.

On May 12th R. H. Kent and F. E. Dawkins held another meeting in Nottingham. Dawkins also held a meeting on the 26th. Definite results are expected shortly.

A four page circular, stating the working-class position and advertising THE SOCIALIST STANDARD has been issued. Twelve copies will be sent post free for 2d. Price to branches, 6s. per 1,000.

A second edition of the Manifesto of the S.P.G.B. is now ready. It deals with the Party's position in regard to the S.D.F., I.L.P., Fabian Society, S.L.P., Trade Unions, etc. Post free 1½d. per copy from Head Office.

The Rules of the Party, as amended at the last Annual Conference, are now ready. They are printed and folded for insertion in membership cards. They can be obtained from Branch Secretaries, or post free from Head Office, 2½d.

Correspondence has passed between the Tottenham branch of the Party and the Tottenham I.L.P. respecting a challenge to debate. Full particulars later.

If one had no previous experience of the hypocrisy of the *Daily News*, one would expect them to admit an error when pointed out to them. On May 10th they printed a report of an application made before the Lord Chief Justice by Mr. Gill, K.C., in connection with the action for alleged libel brought by Mr. Richard Bell, M.P. and the A.S.R.S. against this Party. The report was headed "A Socialist Party 'Gone.'" The following letter was sent to the *Daily News* but was not published by the organ of the Nonconformist conscience.

Socialist Party of Great Britain.
Head Office:
22, Great James Street,
Bedford Row, W.C.
May 15th, 1907.

Sir,
Mr. Richard Bell, M.P. and The Socialist Party.
In your issue of Friday last, under the heading "Socialist Party 'gone,'" you reported an application in re the above Libel action made before the Lord Chief Justice on Thursday, from which it would appear that this Party has "gone away and left no address." This statement is incorrect. The defendants selected to represent this Party appeared last Friday before the Master in Chambers in connection with an application by the Plaintiffs' Solicitors for directions and only failed to answer to their names on Thursday because it is a matter of indifference to this Party when the action is heard.

The reference to "the Solicitor for the defendants" in no way referred to us. Being the only Socialist Party in this country (there are various Reform parties posing as "Socialist") we have no money and therefore, even if we desired to do so, cannot afford to fee legal luminaries. We are fighting our own case.

Yours etc.,
(Sd) R. H. KENT,
General Secretary, S.P.G.B.

To the Editor, "Daily News."

Cycling members who have not yet done so are requested to forward their names and addresses to the Head Office at once.

The E.C. have accepted a Challenge from the Advocates of Industrial Unionism to debate in the columns of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD. The first instalment will probably appear in the July issue.

All members of the Peckham branch are requested to at once send their present addresses to the Head Office, as an important communication will be sent to them as well as to all branch Secretaries in the course of a few days.

Order THE SOCIALIST STANDARD through your local newsagent. If you have any difficulty in obtaining it regularly please communicate with the S.P.G.B., 22, Gt. James St., London, W.C.

BEBEL AND HERVE.

GERMAN PARTY LEADER AS A JINGO.

The "revolutionary" Bebel has again been distinguishing himself as a patriot, both in the Reichstag and in the Press. In the Reichstag he repudiated Liebknecht's book on anti-militarism, and to a French journalist he made an attack on the anti-militarist propaganda of Herve.

The *Times* of 31st April reported that:—"M. Jules Hedeman, of the *Matin*, has seen Herr Bebel, the German Socialist leader, in Berlin, and obtained from him the following statement in writing upon Mr. Herve's anti-militarist propaganda in France:—

"The ideas and the anti-militarist propaganda of Herve are impossible in German Social Democracy. German Social Democracy is the avowed adversary of the present military system, but it considers that a military organisation is necessary in the States now existing so long as all the civilised nations shall not have established conventions and institutions which would once for all render war impossible. So long as the danger exists and wars are possible, every nation should possess a military organisation sufficient for resisting an aggressive war and defending its own territory against the invasions of the enemy.

If German Social Democracy supports every loyal initiative with the object of avoiding war and assuring peace—for example, the organisation of international tribunals of arbitration for the settlement of conflicts between different States—it nevertheless considers a military organisation indispensable so long as the danger of war exists. It is for this reason that German Social Democracy has inscribed in its programme—first, education which will render all citizens fit for military service; secondly, the substitution of militias for permanent armies.

"Consequently, if a member of the German Socialist Party propagates ideas and claims analogous to those that Herve defends, one would be justified in asking, in virtue of the programme of the Socialist Party, does this member still belong to that party? The party could not admit a propaganda which goes directly counter to its programme, which seriously damages the party, and of which the aims are in existing circumstances unattainable, because they are contrary even to the interests of our own country."

Bluntly put, the above means that Bebel regards it as the duty of members of the German Socialist Party to sacrifice themselves in defence of their exploiters' property should the latter be coveted by the exploiters of any other country. In other words it says that the working class of Germany should be prepared to slaughter workers of any other country should their respective masters quarrel over the division of the wealth that has been stolen from the working class!

It is not the first time that Bebel has expressed the sentiments of the Jingo, and one is thankful to learn that a lively protest has been raised in the German Party against his declaration.

Every Socialist must know that the problem of militarism—like that of unemployment—is inseparable from capitalism, and while Herve undoubtedly errs in concentrating his energies upon anti-militarist propaganda since militarism is but an effect of capitalist exploitation, yet our sympathies are heartily with him as against Bebel's patriotic clap-trap.

In his address to comrades of the Socialist Party, Herve said:—

"All Socialists call themselves internationalists, and this, to every Socialist, means to be in favour of the international union of the workers.

"But there are two very different ways of understanding this international union; there is the patriotic way, and the anti-patriotic way.

"The patriotic internationalists say: 'Present day countries, such as history has made them, are moral entities whose existence is useful to human progress.

"However imperfect they may be, however inhuman even they may be for the proletarians, the latter have in each country the duty of defending them when they are attacked.

"We are internationalists, but if the country in which we chanced to be born is attacked we will defend it to the death.

"This in plain language means simply; 'Workers of the world unite; but if your rulers

order you to massacre your comrades, do so!'"

"This singular internationalism a few months ago just missed producing what it threatened. If war had broken out over Morocco between France and Germany, the two proletariats, French and German, would have protested through the voices of their parliamentary tenors; resolutions proclaiming eloquently the fraternity of the two peoples would have been exchanged; and then, fraternally, the French and German working classes would have gone to massacre each other in order to find out with which of the two capitalist classes Morocco would remain."

Herve also says in explaining his own attitude:—

"The workers are disinherited and ill-treated in every existing country.

"All nations are equal, or nearly so, in this respect, particularly now that the capitalist regime renders more and more uniform the material, intellectual, and political conditions of life for the labouring class in all countries; and now that the introduction of the capitalist system in Russia will compel even Tsarism to accord to the Russian workers the essentials of political liberty.

"No country at the present day, is so superior to the others that the workers of that country should get themselves killed in its defence.

"In case of mobilisation, no matter who is the apparent aggressor (it is, indeed, never exactly known, when war breaks out, who is the real aggressor), the proletariats of the belligerent countries should reply to the order to mobilise by insurrection against their own rulers, in an attempt, each in his own country, to establish Socialist Society.

"Rather insurrection than war!"

Certainly no one country's exploiters are so superior to the rest that the workers should sacrifice themselves in defending them; but it is equally certain that if the proletariats were to rise in armed revolt against their rulers immediately on the outbreak of war, while the master class controlled the armed forces of the nation, and while the workers were yet unable and unready to assume control of Society, they would be courting a shambles that would make war peace by contrast.

And when the working class is able and ready to assume control of the political and industrial forces of the country, it is its bounden duty to do so, whether its masters are at war or not, for the lives of millions of workers under capitalist rule perpetuate horrors that are worse than any war.

Since, therefore, Herve's statement implies that the workers even though they are not in a position to successfully emancipate themselves should nevertheless sacrifice themselves in a fruitless and bloody attempt to do so on the outbreak of war, it is necessary to dissent from that portion of his declaration.

Militarism is an inevitable effect of capitalist domination and the struggle for markets and profit, and so long as the workers are ruled by a master class, so long will their masters use them as cannon fodder. The only solution of the question of militarism from the proletarian point of view is the abolition of capitalist exploitation. It is then our duty to concentrate our efforts upon Socialism, upon the triumph of those who labour. The revolutionary Socialist is the truest peace advocate.

The particularly anti-militarist propaganda of Herve has undeniably an educational value, and to that extent it is to be welcomed; it is also an inevitable reaction against the jingoism of men like Bebel. We have so-called Socialist advocates of militarism in this country, and indeed, though it appears a harsh saying to many who believe their parties and their leaders to be Socialist, it is true that The Socialist Party is the only party of which it can be said that it advocates undiluted Socialism.

All the various problems that affect the working class hinge upon the ownership of the means of life, and yet outside of our ranks practically the whole of the workers' energies are being directed against effects rather than to the removal of the cause of the trouble. The origin of poverty, war and slavery lies in class ownership of the means whereby the people live. The straightest road is the shortest road, and the only way to get rid of the evil of militarism is to get rid of capitalism.

F.C.W.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, subscriptions for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, articles, correspondence and advertisements submitted for insertion therein should be addressed, —The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 22, Great James Street, London, W.C., to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD is published on the first Saturday in each month.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office every Tuesday at 7 p.m.

Terms of Subscriptions.

UNITED KINGDOM.

Twelve Months 1s. 6d.
Six Months 9d.

AMERICA.

Twelve Months 50 cents.
Six Months 25 cents.

Scale of Charges for Advertisements.

Per Inch, One Insertion 6 s. d.
Quarter Column do. 2 0 0
Half Column do. 5 0 0
One Column do. 10 0 0

Special arrangements will be made for Advertisements to be inserted in more than one issue.

The Socialist Standard,



SATURDAY, JUNE 1, 1907.

Our Third Anniversary.

The Socialist Party of Great Britain was born on June 12th, 1904, and three years of crowded life have been added unto it. It has passed through periods of difficulty and of unusual stress and each has left it firmer and more convinced than before. The Party has grown, but not with a mushroom growth, while notwithstanding the comparative smallness of its numbers, its voice has been widely heard—and in no uncertain tone—in the cause of the working class.

Numbers, indeed, are never the only essentials to political strength. Our strength is given us by the logical impregnability of our position and by the fright of our opponents who feel that they have no case. Numbers, in fact, as numbers only, are often a source of weakness, and the disastrous results of seeking numbers first have too often been seen for The Socialist Party to make a similar mistake. The organisation that does not keep numbers and popularity ever subordinate to its early aim becomes easily the tool of self-seekers and its original object becomes entirely lost.

The rigidity and correctness of the principles of The Socialist Party, and the knowledge and class-consciousness of its members, form the surest guarantee for the Party's future. In its early stages the very poverty of the Party is a source of strength. No nameless friends put big sums into its coffers and no lucrative offices exist to attract the charlatan and demagogue. All its work is voluntary and has its root in the sincerity and class-consciousness of working men. The place hunter and the man who unintelligently follows the big show are thus repelled, while the thoughtful and sincere are soonest attracted to its ranks. Thus it is that a firm foundation for the Party's useful future is being laid.

It is certainly necessary to the realisation of our object that numbers be on our side, but only in so far as they help toward that realisation can they be welcomed. The emancipation of Labour requires working-class unity, but it can be on none other than a Socialist basis since that alone is of any use. And what, it may be asked, do we mean by a Socialist basis? In the Declaration of Principles of The Socialist Party the essentials of Socialism are, we believe, concisely stated. Assent to these essentials comprises the

the qualification can neither be made broader without abandoning Socialism nor made narrower without excluding Socialists. Hence we are justified in claiming that the principles upon which The Socialist Party is based are those which must be accepted by the mass of the working class before its emancipation can be accomplished.

We can, therefore, look to the future with confidence and bright hopes, and also upon our past with some complacency: not, however, that we deceive ourselves as to the work yet to be done; but the Party is firmly established and its membership earnest and increasing, while we are confident that our Party cannot be drawn one whit from its path, and that it will keep Socialism ever to the forefront until the day is won.

For the rest, the seed is being widely sown, and, hastened to ripeness in the forcing house of Capitalism, the reaping of the bounteous harvest of Socialism cannot long be delayed.

An Interesting Document.

In another column appears a statement issued by some ex-members of the S.D.F. who now form the South Hants Socialist Society. These men have come to see, as we have long seen, that only Socialism matters, and that the S.D.F. is hopeless from the working-class point of view.

In Southampton, as elsewhere, the only result of S.D.F. propaganda and electoral campaigns is working-class confusion or disgust. And no other result could indeed be expected from the intriguing and spineless policy of that organisation; for a particular brand of conscription typifies its conception of revolutionary propaganda, while its main energies are diverted from Socialism to the realisation of children's soup kitchens.

The Policy and Objects of the South Hants Socialist Society are not before us, but we conclude from the statement issued that it is a purely propagandist body. It would appear that disgust with the political intrigues of the S.D.F. has caused them to say that their interest in the use of elections for propaganda purposes has vanished. But has the use of elections for Socialism been given a fair trial in Southampton? Has it not rather been the policy of the S.D.F. there to attempt to get their man into office by hook or by crook, irrespective of principle?

For elections to be of use for propagandist purposes they must be run straight for Socialism and by a straight party. In which case not only are they useful for propaganda, but also to train the Socialist worker in some of the duties before him. In any case, the capture of political power is necessary, and the work must be begun.

The days are past for a purely propagandist body. It is a way of shirking the fight. To merely propagate principles without at the same time organising for their political and economic realisation is to waste valuable effort and to contribute to the still further confusion of our class. The revolution will not be accomplished by words: it needs organisation and action; and step by step as the workers become convinced of the soundness of Socialism they must be enrolled within the ranks of a militant organisation so that the mustering of forces and the training of men may go steadily forward for the capture of the political and industrial machinery of the world for the workers.

OUT OF THE MOUTHS OF BABES.

A story is told by the Bishop of Bath and Wells of a schoolboy who in an essay on how England obtained her colonies wrote:—

Now I will tell you how England obtains her colonies. First she sends out her missionaries. They look about for the best land. When they have found it they call the people to prayer, and when their eyes are fast shut, up goes the Union Jack.

Essex Weekly News.

A LOOK ROUND.

WHEN engaged last month in seeking matter for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, I alighted on a report of a speech at a banquet, which was so up to the standard of capitalist clap-trap that I at once attributed it to a capitalist politician. But I was mistaken.

The words that led me to such a conclusion were the following: "Although at the present time they had not got everything they wanted or everything they ought to have, yet things were vastly different from what they were a few years ago. They had now a tolerably comfortable standard of wages and comparatively shorter hours, while they also had attained to political power."

The speaker was Mr. G. N. Barnes, M.P., and the occasion the annual dinner of the Plaistow and East Ham branch of the A.S.E., held at the "White Horse," East Ham, on May 4th. Mr. Barnes and Sir John Bethell, Liberal M.P. for the Romford Division, were the principal guests.

Of what use is a "tolerably comfortable standard of wages" to the working class if, as usually happens, it is accompanied by more frequent and longer periods of unemployment than were experienced under the old standard?

There are but two classes in Society—the producers of wealth and the master class. If by trade union or any other effort the working class succeed in securing a larger share of the product of their labour, it must necessarily be at the expense of the master class. Competition among the latter compels them to be always on the lookout for means whereby the cost of production may be reduced and profits increased. "Concessions" wrung from them by the organised working class stimulate them in their efforts. As a result, old machinery is scrapped or improved, and new machinery introduced. Under the new conditions fewer workmen are required, and so many are discharged altogether or put on short time. In some cases their places are taken by women and even by boys and girls.

Thus we see the limitations of working-class effort under capitalism, so long as that effort is only directed to palliating the evils of the system, to making it more bearable for the wage-workers.

No doubt the unemployed will be gratified to learn that Mr. Haldane has decided to increase by one shilling per week the minimum rate of pay of leading hands and labourers of the Army Ordnance Department at Devonport and certain other places. He regrets that he cannot accede to the request to make the rate of pay for labourers at Devonport the same as that at Woolwich, where, he points out, the cost of living is much higher.

How interesting to the unemployed labourers of Woolwich, of whom there are just now a few, to be reminded that their rate of wages is higher than that of their fellow labourers at Devonport. The income of the workers must be measured by their purchasing power, not by rates of wages.

But the members of the A.S.E., at any rate, have attained to "a tolerably comfortable standard of wages." Mr. G. N. Barnes says so, and he should know because he is their General Secretary and a "Labour" member.

Professedly, the *Daily News* stands for "righteousness." Thus on May 13 it printed a letter relating to the L.C.C. tram clerks, signed by "New Cross," who complained that the clerks were working every evening till 9 and 10 p.m., and that the overtime pay was at the rate of 1½d. per hour, but in some cases it had not been paid for at all. Here again can we see that rate and payment are not the same.

The letter also appeared in other papers, which qualification for membership of the Party, and

assert no special claim to "righteousness." But in the other papers the letter contained words which were not printed in the *Daily News*, as follows: "Last year the clerks worked from Xmas until the latter end of July until 10 o'clock at night, and without any relaxation."

As the letter appeared in the "righteous" *Daily News*, it would seem that the "wicked" Municipal Reformers were alone the sweaters, but the omitted clause relating to last year involves the "righteous" Progressives.

Mr. W. Lander, of Bolton, in presiding at the 39th Annual Co-operative Congress at Preston on Whit Monday asked whether it was not a fact that in some directions they were following the practices of their competitors? Prize giving, he said, bonus systems, overlapping, and the increase of credit trading could scarcely be described as methods which make for the elevation of the individual, the purifying of trade, and the betterment of the condition of the people.

It was pointed out in our May issue that the Co-operative Societies are capitalist concerns, as of course they could not otherwise be under capitalism. If, therefore, they are to flourish they must fight other capitalist concerns on capitalist lines. They are useful to capitalist politicians because of their pratings of "thrift," "self help," "independence of the State," etc. Many of their leading lights, past and present, are general utility men for the Liberals.

A discussion took place at the Congress on sweating. The President asked whether the Co-operators are sufficiently careful in making their purchases and whether they ever inquire as to the source of supply of their commodities. And everybody seemed pleased when it was announced that Mr. Gladstone had consented to an exhibition of sweated goods in one of the ante-rooms of the House of Commons.

It is sometimes asserted that if there were no purchasers of cheap goods there would be no sweated labour. Apart from the fact that the working class, even when they receive what is considered a fair wage, can only afford to buy cheap goods, what guarantee is there that the workers engaged in producing high priced goods receive higher wages than those who produce low priced goods? At the Congress itself Mrs. Gasson, a member of the National Anti-Sweating League, said that the League had in their possession a lady's blouse which would be sold for 3s. to 40s., for making which the worker received sixpence.

Under capitalism the working class are poor. Some get a "fair" wage and are poor; some get a sweated wage and are poor; others are unemployed and get no wage at all. They are all poor.

And what, after all, is a fair wage? Is it the Trade Union rate? Because if so anything below it must be "sweating." Yet in the same issue of the *Daily News* that reports the discussion referred to above appears an advertisement for a non-Society Linotype operator, used to daily news work, 6,000 essential, salary, 40s. for 50 hours. The minimum rate fixed by the London Society of Compositors is 45s. for 48 hours, but although they have fixed it, it is evident they cannot enforce it. The piece rate for a London lino-operator is 3d. per 1,000. The man who has to produce 6,000 per hour for 50 hours per week should make £3 15s. in wages. He is offered 40s., from which it is also evident that the *Daily News* is not prepared to sacrifice any portion of its revenue in the interest of what are called "fair" wages for the working class.

Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, Labour M.P. for Leicester, has been on the warpath again in the House of Commons. This time he is concerned about Baptists in the Congo. On May 6 he asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he had received from the Baptist Missionary Society complaints that the fiscal imposts upon materials used for the construction of

churches, schools, and hospitals, and for the carrying out of the general work of missionary societies, were heavy and oppressive.

As the effect, if not always the object, of missionary work is to bring those parts of the world in which their operations are carried on under the capitalist form of society, and to fit the wild, untutored savage for wage-slavery, bringing him into competition with white labour, Mr. MacDonald's anxiety to assist the Missionary Societies will no doubt be shared by the members of the I.L.P., whose chairmanship he adorns.

Miss Macarthur, the Secretary of the Women's Trade Union League, who has recently returned from America, told a *Daily Chronicle* interviewer that in the States there is a large proportion of "model" factories, and employers state quite frankly that they give these good conditions because they find it pays.

Just as they become convinced that it will pay, the capitalist class, by legal enactment or otherwise, will institute reforms. It may pay them only from the point of view that the reforms will enable them to get better value out

of the wage workers, or, as Mr. A. J. Balfour put it, as an "antidote to Socialism." Because we of The Socialist Party of Great Britain know this we assert that the working class has no concern with the advocacy of Reforms. If it is claimed that Reforms, temporary though they may be in their effect, are needed, then the surest and quickest way to secure them is to organise for Socialism and for Socialism alone. Then the master class will throw Reforms to the working class as an "antidote."

The Socialist Party of Great Britain is the only Party which at its formation and ever since has declined to side-track the working class by advocating palliatives.

Another interview with Miss Macarthur stated that the attentions showered upon her while in the States had not turned her head. "She stands just where she did and still believes in old clothes and porridge." And yet when in Boston she paid 16s. for a pair of gloves which she could easily buy in London for 2s. 9d. "I wouldn't have bought them" she said, "but I was due at a dinner, and my own were split." Old clothes and porridge, indeed!

J. KAY.

FACTS FOR SOCIALISTS.

THE contention of the Socialist that the whole working class is sweated is amply proved by the evidence of even our opponents. The National Anti-Sweating League, organised in a vain attempt to deal solely with the worst effects of capitalism, provides in its "Report of the Guildhall Conference on a Minimum Wage," information from which may be deduced not alone the futility of the League's attempt to destroy effects without removing the cause, but also the fact that the description given by the Socialist of the position of the working class is not in the slightest exaggerated.

Mr. Stephen Walsh, M.P., in the course of a paper on "Present Steps towards a Minimum Wage," said:

"The average wage paid by the employer in 1888 was 5s. a day for the collier in the Federation area. Even in the great lock-out in 1893, when the colliers' earnings had been uplifted by 40 per cent., the collier could not be earning more than 7s. a day. That might be considered to be a big figure compared with other unskilled trades. But the trade was of a very fluctuating character. It must be remembered that the men were not working more than nine days in the fortnight—in the Midlands, pits were not worked more than three or four days a week. That means that the average wage of the coal hewer comes out at about 28s. a week—a figure borne out by statistics of the money paid in compensation claims. That is the very best class of workman."

"It was in 1894 that a Conciliation Board was formed consisting of twelve representatives from each side, with an independent chairman, who was called upon in the event of disagreement. In 1893 the employers asked for 25 per cent. reduction, and it will be remembered what a terrible lock-out ensued, causing suffering not only to the men but to the public. In 1894 the Conciliation Board was formed, and the men assented to a 10 per cent. reduction. In 1894-96 the Board continued. It lapsed for two years, was revived in 1898, and has since been renewed at periods of three years."

Although the men have this means of defending themselves, they are still earning, roughly, about 28s. a week. Women and boys are very largely outside the union. The girls working on the surface are also not in the union. In fact, it may be said that something like 80 per cent. of the surface hands are not in any organisation, with the consequence that in negotiations with the employers the men are constantly told that these people must be excluded from consideration. The growing youth cannot have his wages determined by the Board, but they are fixed by the employer's estimate of his usefulness.

"Girl labour on the surface has existed for more than 30 years, and Lancashire especially suffers from it. A few pits in the south-west district and a large number in Scotland also

employ girl labour. Thirty years ago girls were paid anything from 1s. 4d. to 2s. 6d. on the pit banks, and they were working, certainly, not longer hours than at present—even shorter hours in Lancashire. The chances are that a woman will now earn from 1s. 3d. to 2s., 1s. 8d. being about the average. As the working hours are about nine and a half per day the wage comes out very little better than 2d. an hour. It might be said that the work did not require much skill or physical energy. Cleaning the dress is not heavy work, and pushing the waggons has been done away with. But many of the women are exposed to the inclemency of the weather. The fact remains, too, that these girls are earning less than they did 30 years ago, and have to depend partly for a living upon the earnings of fathers and brothers in the mine. In no case, if we take Lancashire, are the women working, even in good years, more than nine days a fortnight; and a wage of 6s. 9d. a week, with a reduction for the club of which she is a member, is utterly insufficient for a woman's subsistence wage. Twenty-eight shillings a week paid to a collier are practically wages paid to him and his girls, so that their combined wages may eke out a family living."

"Whereas twenty years ago day wage men were earning 4s. to 5s. a day we find that to-day little more than 40 per cent. is suggested to have been placed on their wages."

"I can only say that this apparent improvement in the men's position is very illusory; the generosity of the employer has not been applied. As a matter of fact, when the increased hours of work and the higher price of fuel, household commodities and house rent are considered, the day hands in the mine are in a worse condition than they were eighteen years ago."

Although one of the most powerful of the trade organisations has been endeavouring to establish a minimum wage for the coal mining industry in the federated area, it has so far not succeeded in doing so. An attempt has been made to abolish the piece rate but there is the risk of inviting competition and bringing in the unemployed compelled by physical necessity. It has been generally found that if a man leaves work in a mine the man who takes his place earns sixpence a day or so lower than the wages his predecessor received. Again, the mining tonnage rate is no indication of the earning capacity of a man. The diversities are so infinite that it is impossible to say what a man can earn on a particular tonnage rate, and so the decision is left to the caprice of the official in the mine."

"We have, however, established over large areas not the mere field rate but price lists and working conditions that have focussed and crystallised payment for varying conditions in the mines. But there is a large section of the mines in which this particular work has not been done."

"Nevertheless, 18 years of continuous effort has failed to delete the present wages system, failed to establish a minimum wage. I can only ask the Conference to consider if a great organisation numbering well over three hundred thousand workers has failed to do this what must be the task of establishing a minimum wage in an industrial body which is hardly organised at all."

Mr. L. G. Chiozza Money, M.P., in dealing with "Sweating in relation to the National Dividend" said:

"The existence of an enormous number of poor people in what is reputed to be a wealthy country is vaguely known and as vaguely wondered at. It should be the endeavour of everyone who is interested in any one or all of the many phases of poverty to acquaint himself specifically with the best information which is available as to the actual amount of poverty which exists, and as to the facts relating to the manner of distribution of wealth which makes poverty so common. Armed with this material, those who sympathise with the sweated can show with near approximation what amount of underpayment of labour exists throughout the country as a whole, and the criminality of gross underpayment in view of the available resources of the nation."

"By the National Dividend we mean the aggregate of all the incomes, large and small, of the people of the United Kingdom. We can form an approximately correct idea of its extent by adding to the incomes of the income tax paying classes, as ascertained by the Inland Revenue authorities, an estimate of the total amount of wages and small salaries earned by those who have not the pleasure of paying income tax. I give a brief account of how I arrived at the income of the British people in 1904."

"First I take the gross assessment to income tax for 1903-4 which is nearly £903,000,000. I correct this, on the one hand, by deducting items which are not real income, such as the cost to a landlord of repairing his house, etc., and, on the other hand, for amounts of income which ought to come, but which do not come, under the attention of the authorities. These various corrections, with the details of which I do not burden this paper, reduce the £903,000,000 of gross assessment to £830,000,000, which figure represents the net income enjoyed by the income tax paying classes."

"Now that disposes of an enormous amount of income, but only of a very small number of people, for the income tax is levied upon those who are in receipt of upwards of £160 a year, so that we have not got very far in point of population. Below the income tax line we have to deal with not only the whole of what are commonly called the manual labour classes, but with those other orders of poor people who, in a very real sense, are working men, viz., small tradesmen, clerks, shopmen, travellers, canvassers, teachers, agents, small farmers, inn-keepers, lodging house keepers, civil servants, pensioners, and so forth. From a close examination of the census records I have arrived at the conclusion that there are about three millions belonging to those occupations who earn less than £3 a week. How much do they earn on the average? I have gone over that very carefully and believe that their average earnings cannot be placed higher than £75 a year, ranging from the 8s. or 10s. a week of the office boy to the £3 a week of the superior clerk. Accepting this estimate tentatively, we get as the income of this particular part of the working population £225,000,000."

"It remains to deal with the greatest bulk of all, viz., the manual workers commonly so called, including, in addition to all those engaged in agricultural, industrial, and domestic service, soldiers, sailors, policemen, and postmen."

"Those, using the census of 1901 as a basis, I estimate to number 15,000,000, men, women, boys, and girls, in the year 1904. Unfortunately, we have not in this country, as we ought to have, a permanent and continuous census of wages. We are very neglectful in the matter of records, and the only official census of wages which we have ever made was got out in 1886 by the Board of Trade. I have used this as a basis and allowed for the changes of wages which have taken place since that date."

"In 1886, the average wage, giving due weights to the respective proportions of men,

women, and children, was only 17s. 6d. per week. In 1904, allowing for the general rise in wages in the interval, it amounted to 20s. 6d. per week. It should be borne in mind that this figure represents rates of wages and not earnings. If we want earnings we must make an allowance for idleness from whatever cause arising, whether from sickness, accident, lock-out, strike, weather, slack time, total unemployment, or drink. Allowing for these things, we cannot assume that the average wage is earned for more than 44 weeks out of 52 weeks in such a year as 1904—20s. 6d. a week for 44 weeks means £45 in the year."

"But we have to consider that not all those who figure in the census sheets as manual workers can be counted as normal workers. There is the great army of casuals, ne'er-do-wells, aged persons, men and women broken in health, and last, but not least, those employed in what are called sweated industries. I do not think that, of the 15,000,000 manual workers, we can estimate these most unfortunate of the industrial army at less than one-fifth of the whole, or say, 1,000,000 persons. The earnings of these 1,000,000 persons I estimate at £25,000,000 per annum, or an average of about 10s. per week per person."

"The remaining 14,000,000 manual workers I assume to draw the average earnings of £45 a year already referred to, which amounts to £630,000,000. With the £25,000,000 of the unfortunate 1,000,000 persons we arrive at £655,000,000 as the total earnings of the manual labourers in 1904."

"We have now got out the aggregate income of the United Kingdom, made up as follows:—
(a) Those with over £3 a week... £830,000,000
(b) Those with less than £3 a week (Manual workers £655,000,000 plus, lower middle classes, £225,000,000) ... 880,000,000
£1,710,000,000

"It will be seen that the income respectively above and below the income tax line of £3 per week is almost equal in amount. £830,000,000 lies above the line; £880,000,000 lies below the line."

"The important consideration now arises, how many people enjoy these respective amounts of income—how many people in our nation of 43,000,000 people have over £3 per week? This important question I have been able to answer, and as the method of obtaining the answer has survived a great deal of both friendly and hostile criticism, it may be taken as being nearly accurate as is needed for a proper judgment to be formed in the matter. The number of income tax paying individuals is, as nearly as possible, one million. It follows that nearly half of the income of the nation is possessed by one million people, who, if each of them be taken as a representative of a family of five, stand for only 5,000,000 people in the nation of 43,000,000 people. The second half of the national dividend is shared up by the balance of the nation, viz., 38,000,000 of people."

"These are exceedingly significant and extraordinary facts, but even more significant and extraordinary is the further calculation which I will now put before you."

"I have been able to split up the one million income tax payers at the £700 a year line. Between £160 a year and £700 a year there are 750,000 taxpayers, representing 3½ millions of people, who take only £245,000,000 out of the £830,000,000. The balance of the £830,000,000 is £585,000,000, and this enormous sum is the annual income of only 250,000 taxpayers, who represent with their families not more than 1¼ million of the entire population. Broadly speaking, one-thirtieth of the entire population take more than one-third of the entire national dividend of the country. To put it in another way, 1¼ million people take in rent and interest a sum as large as the entire earnings of the manual labour classes, who, with their dependents, number 30,000,000 of people."

"The 250,000 taxpayers who take nearly £600,000,000 worth of income, include in their number, of course, the owners of practically all the factories, docks, warehouses and workshops of the country. The small number of income tax payers will, perhaps, not seem so surprising

if it is remembered that there are only 100,000 factories in the whole of the United Kingdom, while the total number of factories, workshops, docks, wharves, quays, and warehouses registered in the United Kingdom does not amount to more than about 250,000."

"There is much talk of small shareholders, but as a matter of fact, shareholders, both large and small, are remarkably few. There is a firm in the City—Messrs. George S. Smith and Son—who collect all shareholders' names, and make an alphabetical list of them for advertising purposes. Mr. George Smith informs me that there are only 500,000 names on his lists, which are practically complete, so that of the 1,000,000 people above the income tax line, only one-half are shareholders. The whole of the railway stock of the country is owned by only 180,000 people."

"It would be the easiest possible matter, if I had time, to put before you hundreds of current balance sheets, and to show you by existing examples the manufacture in detail of the contrasting elements of Riches and Poverty, which I have already shown you in the gross. The process is going on everywhere around us, and I hold that it is futile to talk about remedies for sweating while we consent to methods which produce poor people who, in their turn, are catered for by the supply of sweated products. The poor are the chief customers of the sweated."

"I do not propose to place many examples before you, but content myself by presenting several striking ones which may be taken as illustrative rather than exceptional. I have examined for 1904 the balance sheet of Messrs J. Lyons and Co., who employ a very large number of young girls at low wages. I find that the Company's gross profits on trading for that year are £474,000, while salaries, wages, rents, rates, repairs, horse-keep, maintenance, etc., only come to £327,000. There was, therefore, a net profit of £147,000. I don't know exactly what salaries and wages come to, but it is clear from the balance sheet that they were less than the £147,000 worth of profit. Thus the sleeping partners got more than the working partners."

"The case of the Newcastle-on-Tyne Electric Supply Company Limited is even clearer. I have the balance sheet for 1905 which shows that the people of Newcastle paid the Company £145,000 for Electric current, etc., and that the Company paid for rent, coal, etc., only £37,000; for wages only £34,000, leaving a profit of £74,000. Here the sleeping partners took far more than the working partners."

"Take again the National Telephone Company's balance sheet for 1904. The public paid the Company £2,000,000, and the total outlay for rents, wages, materials, management, etc., was £1,150,000 leaving a net profit of £850,000. It is perfectly clear from these figures that the sleeping partners took far more than the working partners."

"I should like it to be particularly observed that when I refer to wages in connection with these balance sheets I mean not only wages for manual labour but for mental labour also."

"I repeat that it is unnecessary to multiply examples but these lamentable contrasts between profits and wages are a common-place of limited liability balance sheets."

"It is the fact that the underpayment of labour is deliberately counted upon which makes it possible for company promoters to promise large dividends. Thus, in a gas company prospectus issued in the public press in 1905, it was deliberately calculated that labour, manual and mental, would cost less than £2,000 per annum, while nearly £6,000 of profit per annum would result from the operations."

"It should not be forgotten, also, that usury grows by what it feeds on. As soon as the big dividend is realised, usury can claim its capital value in the stock market and the rise in value of the shares, instead of adding to the remuneration of the worker, actually becomes a weapon to be used against him. This, again, I may illustrate. I wrote in the *Daily News* of the 30 per cent. dividends and the low wages of Messrs. Lyons and Co. An indignant shareholder immediately wrote to me to point out that: "Most of the shareholders have paid £6 or £7 per share, and so get a return of not more than 5 per cent."

INTERESTING DOCUMENTS. No. 1.

The following circular has been issued by some of the oldest members of the Southampton Branch of the Social Democratic Federation. Amongst the signatories is an ex-member of the Provincial Executive of the S.D.F.

SOUTH HANTS SOCIALIST SOCIETY.

The above Society has been formed by former members of the S.D.F. with the object of spreading by means of literature, and if need be, by public meetings, the ideals and principles of Socialism.

Being unable to remain in and work with the S.D.F. owing to the change that has gradually come over it whereby the propagation of reforms and the contesting of elections instead of being a subsidiary part, as of yore, has become the primary part of its work, leaving the ideals and principles of Socialism to be a formal part of its creed in much the same way as it has always been with the Trades Council and the Trades Unions which boast of a Socialist constitution. Indeed, the S.D.F. has for some time past so completely allied itself with these bodies and assimilated its work with theirs as to be hardly distinguishable from them.

We still believe there is plenty of scope for the propagation of Socialism and that all the reforms together would, if achieved, be of very little use in remedying the social evils of which we complain.

Although, owing to such bad conditions as do exist among the workers, one is much tempted to devote undue attention to reforms, it cannot be too often or too strenuously asserted that all and every reform possible in Capitalist Society would do next to nothing in the end as the capitalist class has always shown that it knows full well how to force back with one hand what it is compelled to pay out with the other. It is surely significant that after all the years occupied in obtaining reforms, that it should be even now a debatable point as to whether the workers as a class are any better off to-day than they were at the beginning.

Even in the case of such apparently obviously desirable reforms as state maintenance—or, as it is watered down to, state feeding of the children—and the relief of the unemployed, it is fairly clear that the Capitalist Class will take care to benefit more itself than the workers by the greater exploitation of the young, by reason of their more fit condition making them better producing mediums, and from having their reserve army kept by the state for them. And it must not be lost sight of that a reserve army of unemployed is a necessary condition of Capitalist Society.

Brutal as it may seem to say so, it is clear to us that the only purpose of reforms is to put off the day when the workers will come by their own. The workers will always be badly fed, housed and clothed so long as they are robbed, and robbed they will be so long as capitalism lasts.

What interest we had in reforms, municipal or otherwise, and in the use of elections for propagation of Socialism has vanished. We have been disillusioned by watching its effects and results. The failure to get any substantial gain from these sources is not accounted for by the good or bad actions of individuals but by the conditions of the problem itself.

The so-called advance, the growth of the Labour Party, is in our opinion but the erection of a bulwark against the real movement—the only one of any use to the proletariat—i.e., the Socialist movement.

Eleven years ago in a Manifesto the local S.D.F. said as follows:

"We, Revolutionary Social-Democrats, disdain to conceal our principles. We proclaim the class war. We hold that the lot of the workers cannot to any appreciable extent be improved except by a complete overthrow of this present capitalist system of Society. The time for Social tinkering has gone past."

That is where the S.D.F. stood then and that is where we stand now, and we are convinced that it is only from that standpoint that any good can be done.

Numbers have no charm for us. All we want is that the ideals and principles of Socialism shall be spread. We do not desire to make

members unless we first of all make them Socialists.

If you think you would like to help us, join us. We require everyone who does come to come to us whole-heartedly. We prefer the help of one sincere member who is in the light to twenty who are groping in the dark or floating on the tide of expediency catching at straws.

We send herewith our Object, policy and rules so that you can see what we are after. If any explanation is required we are prepared to give it. If you want to follow up your study of Socialism we are prepared to offer friendly advice. If you want literature we are prepared to supply you.

"Work for Socialism—all else is vain."

LABOUR PARTY POLITICS: A CONFUSED JUMBLE.

Mr. J. Ramsay MacDonald, M.P., Chairman of the Independent Labour Party, Secretary of the Labour Party in the House of Commons, writer on capitalist politics in capitalist newspapers, has, according to the *Morning Post* of May 8th, written to the Leicester branch of the Church Socialist League as follows:—

I give my episcopal blessing with much pleasure. The Church Socialist League ought to flourish, for upon what more congenial soil can Socialism grow than the ethics of the Gospel and the maxims of the Fathers? Moreover, I think, when we know each other better, it will be found that the materialism which the Church is always saying that she is warring against is precisely the thing that we Socialists are warring against. The dross of life is oppressing us. It is in our eyes and we see not; it is in our mouths, and we cannot speak the truth; it is in our hearts, and we cannot worship what it is that we should worship. We are striving for all sorts of rights—the right to hold acres and to enjoy incomes which we have never earned; the right to have drink on Sunday; the right to be fleeced by bookmakers; the right to starve our children; and we do not seem to have the faculty to discriminate which of these are of God and which of the Devil. So our politics are a confused jumble of utilities at their worst and an ineffective striving after vague desires at their best. We have to discover the qualitative things of life, and it is because your Church Socialist League is going to strive to do that that I readily respond to your request to bless you.

This letter is such a "confused jumble" that one has a difficulty in understanding it, but we will try. "We Socialists" of course refers to Mr. MacDonald and his fellow members and supporters of the Labour Party, Independent or otherwise. These cannot speak the truth because the dross of life is in their mouths and is oppressing them. It was not known before that this was the reason, but a note can now be made of their excuse. It is hoped they will succeed in their attempt to secure the right to drink on Sunday. To do so is very refreshing especially after an hour or so's open-air speaking. When they have secured this right may they be oppressed by sufficient of the dross of life to exercise it—to afford a decent drink and plenty of it. It may interest them to know that a prominent Liberal Statesman, now deceased, is credited with having declared that "bitter beer is the finest drink that has been invented since the nectar of the gods went out of fashion." Be that as it may, they are of course at liberty to select their own "pizen" from the various kinds on tap.

Undoubtedly their politics are a confused jumble at their worst, and one may go farther and declare that they are usually at their worst.

They may think this is due to the seeming absence of the faculty to discriminate which of these rights are of God and which of the Devil, others think it is due, in some cases, to their ignorance of the working-class position, and in other cases to their desire for political aggrandisement.

In the columns of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, month by month, have been given evidence of this confused jumble. The writers have not got the dross of life in their eyes and can see.

The Independent Labour Party, of which Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, M.P., is chairman, claim to be the proud parent of the (Parliamentary) Labour Party, of which Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, M.P., is Secretary. The electoral policy of the two parties is, on paper, identical. It is also identical in practice, but whilst on paper it is

understandable, in practice it is a "confused jumble." The paper policy is summed up in the following clause of the Declaration of the Labour Party: "To abstain strictly from identifying themselves with or promoting the interests of any section of the Liberal or Conservative Parties."

Although subscribing to this policy several members of the Labour Party threw it over at the General Election, when they saw that by adhering to it they would fail to secure election. Amongst them were Mr. Ramsay MacDonald at Leicester, Mr. Parker at Halifax, Mr. T. F. Richards at Wolverhampton, and Mr. Stuart at York. Details of the compacts made with the Liberals will be found in THE SOCIALIST STANDARD for March and July, 1906.

Mr. W. Crooks, M.P., has signed the Declaration, but that did not prevent him attending the Banquet to Mr. S. L. Hughes at the Trocadero Restaurant on April 7th, 1906, organised by "some of the best known names in Liberal politics" because "the great Radical victory which had just been won was due to men like Mr. Hughes."

Mr. W. Thorne, M.P., has signed the Declaration but yet supported Mr. Percy Alden, Liberal member for Tottenham, at the General Election in company with Messrs. Will Crooks, John Burns, H. H. Asquith, Herbert Gladstone, and others.

Messrs. C. W. Bowerman, M.P. and John Hodge, M.P., have signed the Declaration, but identified themselves with the Liberals (masquerading as Progressives) at the last London County Council Election. Mr. Bowerman was advertised to speak at Kinsinghill Street Schools, Pentonville, and Mr. Hodge was announced to take the chair at Maryon Park Schools, Charlton.

On April 21st last, Mr. A. Henderson, Whip of the Labour Party, was one of the chief speakers at Hford Town Hall, at a "Temperance" meeting. Every student knows that this "Temperance" brigade is a wing of the Liberal Party. Mr. Henderson declared that they did not intend that the Government should put off "Temperance" reform in favour of Land Reform, or Home Rule or anything else. They must tell the Government straight that "Temperance" must be first.

When the Stepney Bye Election took place last month Mr. Ben Cooper was adopted as the official Liberal Candidate. He declared the issue was simply Free Trade versus Tariff Reform. According to the *Daily Chronicle* Mr. Bowerman was one of the first to write and offer his services in support of the Liberal nominee. The Parliamentary Committee of the Free Union Congress endorsed his candidature. Messrs. Shackleton, Gill, Barnes, Bowerman, Wilkie and Thorne, all Labour M.P.s who have signed the Declaration of the Labour Party are members of the Parliamentary Committee.

Mrs. Philip Snowden was a delegate to the Annual Conference of the Independent Labour Party at Derby this year. During the Whibley don bye-election last month she was one of the hardest workers for the Liberal candidate, the Hon. Bertrand Russell, who "supported the Liberal Government in everything excepting its attitude on the question of Women's Suffrage."

In view of these facts there can be no question that the politics of Mr. Ramsay MacDonald and his Labour Party friends are a "confused jumble of utilities." Mr. MacDonald's phrase "touches the spot."

J.K.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

A HISTORY OF FACTORY LEGISLATION, by B. L. Hutchins and A. Harrison, D. Sc. (Lon.) with a preface by Sidney Webb. Westminster; P. S. King and Son. New edition, 2s. 6d., net.

THE NEXT, THE PRESENT AND THE FUTURE: A SOCIAL STUDY AND REVIEW, by H. Llewellyn Heath, D.P.H. London; P. S. King and Son. Cn. Svo. Cloth. Seven plates. 2s. 6d., net.

CHINESE LABOUR QUESTION FROM WITHIN, by F. H. P. Creswell. London; P. S. King and Son. Penny Svo. 4d., net.

REPORT OF FREE LIBRARIES COMMITTEE TO THE DUNDEE TOWN COUNCIL FOR 1906.

S.P.G.B. LECTURE LIST. JUNE, 1907.

SUNDAYS.	9th.	16th.	23rd.	30th.
Battersea, Prince's Head	11.30 T. W. Allen	H. Newman	T. A. Jackson	J. Fitzgerald
"	7.30 E. Fairbrother	E. Fawcett	T. A. Jackson	T. W. Allen
Canning Town, Beckton Rd.	7.30 F. E. Dawkins	W. Gifford	J. H. Kennett	J. Kent
Clapham Common	3.30 H. Newman	T. A. Jackson	E. Fairbrother	T. A. Jackson
Finsbury Park	3.30 J. Fitzgerald	A. Anderson	A. Anderson	J. Crump
Fulham, op. site Salisbury Hotel	7.30 H. Newman	J. Fitzgerald	J. J. Humphrey	R. H. Kent
Ilford, Loxford Bridge	7.30 W. Gifford	J. Kent	W. A. Cole	H. C. Phillips
Jolly Butchers' Hill	11.30 J. Crump	J. Fitzgerald	J. Kent	W. A. Cole
"	7.30 A. Anderson	T. W. Allen	J. Crump	F. E. Dawkins
Manor Park Broadway	11.30 J. Kent	W. A. Cole	F. E. Dawkins	J. Kent
Paddington, Prince of Wales	11.30 R. H. Kent	F. C. Watts	T. W. Allen	F. C. Watts
Plaistow, Green Gate	11.30 W. A. Cole	F. E. Dawkins	R. H. Kent	W. Gifford
Tooting Broadway	7.30 T. A. Jackson	R. H. Kent	H. Newman	J. Fitzgerald
Tottenham, West Green Cnr.	11.30 A. Anderson	J. Crump	J. Fitzgerald	A. Anderson
"	7.30 J. Fitzgerald	A. Anderson	A. Anderson	A. Anderson
Watford Market Place	7.30 F. S. Leigh	E. Fairbrother	J. Fitzgerald	F. S. Leigh
Woolwich, Beresford Sq.	11.30 F. E. Dawkins	T. A. Jackson	H. Newman	F. E. Dawkins

SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.**HEAD OFFICE:**

22, GREAT JAMES STREET, LONDON, W.C.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

- BATTERSEA.**—A. Jones, Secretary, 3, Mathew St., Latchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at S.P.G.B., Laburnam House, 134, High Street, Battersea, S.W. Club open every evening.
- CENTRAL.**—Membership obtained only through the Executive Committee. Applications should be sent to the General Secretary.
- EAST HAM.**—W. Gifford, Sec., 31, Maryland Square, Stratford. Branch meets Mondays at 7.30 at 447, Katherine Rd., Forest Gate.
- EDMONTON.**—Sidney Auty, Sec., 60, Gilpin Grove, Edmonton. Branch meets Wednesdays 8.30.
- FULHAM.**—E. Waller, Secretary, 45, Warple Way, Wandsworth, S.W. Branch meets June 3 and alternate Mondays at 8 at Ingram's Coffee Tavern, Fulham Cross.
- ISLINGTON.**—Branch meets Fri. at 8.30 at 79, Grove Rd., Holloway. Communications to the Sec.
- PADDINGTON.**—Communications to F. Linfield, 18, Goldney Rd., Paddington, W. Branch meets every Wednesday, 8.30 p.m., at Harley's Coffee Tavern (foot of Lock Bridge), Harrow Rd.
- PECKHAM.**—W. Wren, Sec., 91, Evelina Rd., Nunhead, S.E. Branch meets every Wed. at 8.30.
- ROMFORD DIVISION.**—All communications to the Secretary, S.P.G.B. Club, 39, York Road, Ilford. Branch meets Mondays at 8 at Club.
- TOOTING.**—P. Dumenil, Secretary, 36, Byton Road, Tooting, S.W. Branch meets every Wed. at 8 p.m. at Goring's Dining Rooms, Goringe Park Parade, Tooting Junction.
- TOTTENHAM.**—T. Lobb, Sec. Branch meets Mon. 8 p.m., at Sunbeam Coffee Tavern, High Rd.
- WATFORD.**—T. Wilkins, Sec., 4, Marlborough Rd., Branch meets alternate Fridays at 8 p.m.
- WEST HAM.**—Branch meets Mondays 7.30, followed at 8.30 by discussion, at 447, Katherine Road, Forest Gate.
- WOOD GREEN.**—H. Crump, Secretary, 39, Hermitage Road, Harringay, N. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Mondays at 8.30 at 2, Station Road, Wood Green.
- WOOLWICH & PLUMSTEAD.**—A. E. Rance, Sec., 71a, Marmadon Rd., Plumstead. Branch meets on 2nd and 4th Wednesdays in month at 80, Conway Road, Plumstead.

INFORMATION

concerning the Party can be obtained of the following
BRADFORD (Yorks).—Ben Wilde, 78, Godwin St.
BURTON-ON-TRENT.—J. Blundell, 157, New St.
LIVERPOOL.—J. M. O. Sullivan, 4, Laburnam Grove, Litherland.
MANCHESTER.—J. Marsh, 97, Blantyre Street, Swinton, Nr. Manchester.

WHOLESALE AGENTS FOR**THE SOCIALIST STANDARD.**

HENDERSON, 16, Paternoster Row, E.C.
JOHN HEYWOOD, Ltd., Deansgate, Manchester, and Lamb's Conduit St., London.
W. H. SMITH & SON, Blackfriars St., Manchester.
J. NAYLOR & Co., 147 & 149, Gt. Junction St., Leith.
BARTLETT, 7, Turnpike Lane, Hornsey.

RETAIL AGENTS.

JACQUES, 191, Old Street, E.C.
SMITH (late Manners), 47, Fetter Lane, E.C.
VESPERMAN, 251, Gray's Inn Road, W.C.
WREN, 91, Evelina Road, Nunhead, S.E.
ROOK, 9a, Cursitor Street, E.C.
GRANT, Ilford Hill, Ilford.
SIMPSON, 209, Leytonstone Road, Stratford, E.
BREWSTER, 153, Barking Rd., Canning Town.
WARNE, 1a, Queen's Square, Upton Park, E.
MENHINICK, 40, King William St., London B'dge.
RAGGETT, 10, St. Leonard's Road, Poplar.
DAVY, Flood Street, Chelsea.

Printed by A. Jacob, Globe Press, Forest Lane, Stratford, for the Proprietors, The Socialist Party of Great Britain, and published at 22, Great James Street, London.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.**OBJECT.**

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles**THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN****HOLDS**

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master-class, and the consequent enslavement of the working-class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working-class from the domination of the master-class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working-class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist-class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working-class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working-class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master-class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

PAPER STALL, corner St. Thomas' Rd., Finsbury Pk.
 FOX, 18a, New Kent Road, S.E.
 BURKE, 35, Ford Street, Bow, E.
 LIBRAIRE COSMOPOLITE, 56, Charlotte Street, London, W.
 NEWLAND, 18, High Street, Camden Town.
 Miss DICKENSON, 96, Laureston St., Edinburgh.
 E. WALLACE, 78, Fountainbridge, Edinburgh.
 P. MACINNIS, 3, West Nicolson St., Edinburgh.
 GEDD, 181, Dairy Road, Edinburgh.
 SHELLEY BOOK AGENCY, Gloucester Street, Oxford.
 H. RUBIN, 13, Cottenham St., Westgate Hill, Newcastle-on-Tyne.
 E. G. SMITH, 126, Tunnel Road, Liverpool.
 ASHWORTH, 178, London Road, Manchester.
 EDWARDS, 65, Manchester Rd., Hollinwood, Oldham.
 N. MELLINSKY, 34, Meanwood Rd., Leeds.
 A. POLLOCK, 18, Richardson St., Halifax.
 W. K. LIGGATT, 27, Stevenson St., Calton, Glasgow.
 L. MACARTNEY, 181, Overgate, Dundee.
 LEWIS, Wood Street, Walthamstow.
 McPHELY, 33, London Road, Glasgow.
 LOGAN, 1, Macfarlane St., Gallowgate, Glasgow.
 HIGGINS, 52, Argyle St., Anderson, Glasgow.
 MARTIN, 368, Govan St., S.S. Glasgow.
 HUNTER, 151, Main St., Gorbals, Glasgow.
 McDONALD, 203, Castle St., Tounhead, Glasgow.
 NAYLOR, 177b, Gt. Junction St., Leith.
 NAYLOR, 1a, Bowling Green St., Leith.

BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, &c. to be obtained of the S.P.G.B., 22, Great James St., London, E.C.
CAPITAL (Karl Marx) ... 5s. 6d.
SIX CENTURIES OF WORK AND WAGES (Thorold Rogers) ... 5s. 6d.
POVERTY (Rowntree) ... 4s. 6d.
SOCIALIST STANDARD
 Vols. I. & II (Bound) each 3s. 0d.
MANIFESTO AND RULES of the S.P.G.B. ... 1½d.
FROM HANDICRAFT TO CAPITALISM (Kautsky) 1½d.
COMMUNIST MANIFESTO ... 2½d.
WAGE LABOUR & CAPITAL (Marx) 1½d.
JONES' BOY ... 1½d.
SOCIALISM & THE WORKER (Sorge) 1½d.
HOW I BECAME A SOCIALIST (Morris) 1½d.
THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION (Kautsky) 7½d.
ALL POST FREE.

VOL. II OF THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

(Sept., 1905 to Aug., 1906.)

Well bound in cloth, gold lettered,
 Post Free ... 3s. 0d.

MANIFESTO OF THE Socialist Party of Great Britain.

Second Edition, with preface, now ready.

Explains the Party's position towards the S.D.F., I.L.P., Fabian Society, Trade Unions, S.L.P., etc.

Price - One Penny.

Post free 1½d. per copy from the S.P.G.B., 22, Great James Street, London, W.C.
 The Trade supplied by Henderson, 16, Paternoster Row, London, E.C.

NOW READY.**S.P.G.B. LIBRARY, No. 2.****From Handicraft to Capitalism,**

Translated from the German of
KARL KAUTSKY.

The only translation in the English language of this important section of the famous "Das Erfurter Program."

POST FREE ... 1½d.
 S.P.G.B., 22, Great James St., London, W.C.

The Head Office of The Socialist Party of Great Britain is at 22, Great James Street, London, W.C.

THE
Official Organ
OF
THE
Socialist Party
OF
Great Britain.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

No. 35. Vol. 3.]

LONDON, JULY, 1907.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

THE ROOTS OF SOCIAL CHANGE.

WHY WE ARE WAGE SLAVES.

THE causationist, seeing everywhere in nature a concatenation of cause and effect, as the links of a chain running through endless time and through endless space, sees everywhere also that this infinite variety of happenings occurs in accordance with immutable laws, too impassive to be weak, too dispassionate to be stern. Law, and order, he knows to be universal, and chaos is a term which has no meaning to him save as the description of his own limited view and knowledge of phenomena.

The science of political economy enquires into the movements of man in the quest for the material means of subsistence, and shows that these movements also, no less than the rolling of celestial orbs, are governed by laws, and conform to the purposeless dictates of causal sequence.

Thus, there is a law of capitalist production which ordains that human labour-power shall be in constant competition with machinery, and shall as constantly be displaced and defeated by its formidable rival. And there is a law that, notwithstanding that the result is bitter as blood to the great working class of the world, yet must working-class intelligence and working-class strength go on improving and developing this machinery of production, to their own undoing, as long as the capitalist system of profit production shall prevail. There is a further law—a law of wages—under governance of which wages are determined by the cost of subsistence under certain prevailing conditions. There are many other stated laws controlling the economic movements of man, and many more, doubtless enough, awaiting human recognition and enunciation.

The knowledge of these laws is of vital importance to the workers. Such knowledge alone can explain to them how, and in what circumstances, the wealth of the world is produced—and who can it more closely concern than those who produce it all and who enjoy so little of it? Such knowledge is the only sure foundation of Socialist faith—our pillar of fire by night, our pillar of cloud by day—the one unerring index where all else is confusion.

The reformer is a reformer only because he is ignorant of the existence of the laws governing social growth, or because he fails to realise their universal applicability, and the unbending potency with which they reduce all human wishes, as far as they are in opposition to them, to merest empty vanity.

The science of political economy, then, so long the peculiar study of our masters and pastors—those who rule, is an essentially necessary study to the workers—those who are ruled. For if the knowledge to be gained from it is something less than "the wing wherewith we fly to heaven," this alone can serve us as hands and knees whereon to crawl from hell.

To start at the beginning, or, shall we say—to start at a beginning—since it is a beginning only for our purpose, and to reduce our lesson to the utmost simplicity, it can easily be understood that given as a condition the private ownership

of all the means of producing those things which are necessary to support human life, a certain other concomitant must co-exist, as the inevitable effect of the given cause: private ownership of the means of life—namely, all those who are excluded from ownership are dependent upon those who possess the means of living.

This is a fact that cannot be controverted. The owners of the means of subsistence might be all that the noblest pagan and Christian philosophers exhort them to be, might be the very embodiment of all the graces, but still the dependency is there, unaffected, as dependency, by any magnanimity of the possessors.

Given then this private ownership of the land (in political economy the term includes the seas and lakes and rivers), from which all material wealth flows, and the machinery of production—the channel by which it flows; and given also this dependence of those who, not being possessors, have no free access to the means of producing the necessities of life; and given further, human nature, not as it was before it fell if it has fallen, or as it will be when it rises again if it ever does rise again, but as it is presented to us at this time of day, the unfinished work of history: given all these conditions then nothing is more certain than that this ownership by a class of the means whereby all men must live, will be used, not, perhaps, consciously and willfully to the detriment of the non-possessors, but, over the general field of operations, first and last for the benefit of the possessors. What is there else in ownership, but that it confers on the possessor some advantage or advantages which are conditional upon possession, and which therefore are denied to the non-possessor?

All these conditions then we have in present-day society—the ownership of the means of life by a class, the dependence of the non-possessors upon that class, and the exclusion of these propertyless ones from access to the means of subsistence except upon condition of advantage to the class which possesses all productive wealth.

Here is a certain set of conditions which, in the very nature of things, stand as causes from which effects must follow. If the whole of the propertyless resolved to sit themselves down and die rather than exist in dependence, that would be an effect of the causes, and a perfectly possible effect—if the resolution were there. But history shows that the propertyless did not do so, but that some other condition prevailed, which made them surrender.

Since, then, submission to dependence was inevitable, and this dependence demanded certain advantages to be yielded to the possessing class, what form did this submission take and why? and what form did these advantages take, and also why?

With the means of life in the hands of a class there are several forms of subjection which might conceivably follow. But what shall it be in the case we are supposing? Shall it be chattel slavery? Shall it be serfage? Shall it be wage slavery? That must be decided by the

degree of development of the instruments of production primarily, and by the social conditions which have arisen out of this historic development. Thus, because the means of producing wealth had not advanced to that stage in which they enabled human energy to produce more than sufficient for its own reproduction, (and are therefore profitless to any but the user)—such means of production are common property, and form the base of a communal society; but growing out of such a communal form of society, and keeping more or less even pace with that development of the means of production which *does* enable human energy to produce a surplus of wealth beyond that necessary for its own reproduction, we find a form of subject labour. Why does this subjugation take the shape of chattel slavery and not of wage slavery?

Because, in the first place, developing imperceptibly out of a system based upon communal ownership, the propertyless ones are mainly drawn from outside the community, prisoners of war, who are no longer eaten now that there exist means of making them produce their own living and something over. And being captives they must be the *property* of their captors, and kept in subjection by the sword. In the second place a wage is essentially a price, a money equivalent of the thing which it is the price of. It is one side of an equation which is possible only through the operation of the laws of supply and demand in a competitive market; and being an equivalent only because it has freedom of motion to find its own level and equal through the ceaseless fluctuation of supply and demand, it can only be the equivalent of something of like fluidity. Wages, then, presupposes free labourers—labourers, that is, who are owners of their labour-power, and can within certain limits withhold it, though under certain pressure they must exchange it in the end; presupposes also a world of commodities (goods produced for sale and which are still "in the market") since it can only exist as the counterpart of innumerable other commodities, for which it is readily exchangeable at current rates; presupposes also a competitive market, where goods produced for sale find their quantitative likeness in their qualitative opposites; presupposes also, and therefore, and finally, a certain development of the means of production, and of the method of production, and of accumulated wealth, none of which conditions can exist until long after the means of producing wealth have reached the stage suggested above. That is why the form of subjugation at this period is chattel slavery, and not wage-slavery.

In what has been said may be found also the answer to the previous question, why did the subjection of the propertyless take the form that characterises it to-day? But in order that a proper understanding of this vitally important matter may be attained, it will be advisable to analyse yet a little more minutely the causes which give birth to the effect. This will form a fitting subject for a second article. A.E.J.

MR. BARNES AND THE A.S.E.

The letter given below is a copy of one sent to the secretary of Ipswich Branch of the Operative Bricklayers' Society in reply to an invitation to speak at an engineers' meeting to be held in that town on May 25th, with Mr. G. N. Barnes as chief speaker.

While thanking both Bro. Hatchelor for suggesting and yourself for asking me to attend the Meeting of Engineers, there are certain important reasons why I could not appear on a platform with Mr. Barnes, to support him or his views and position in any way. As a Socialist I hold that the working-class can only get out of the slough of misery and degradation in which they exist to-day by their consciously organising for the overthrow of the system that produces these conditions—namely, the capitalist system of Society. Until this is done the bad effects which our class suffers under, equally here in London as it does in Ipswich, and, in fact, everywhere that capitalism reigns, will, apart from some temporary fluctuations, tend to become worse. When the working class recognises this fact then it will organise itself into the political and economic organisations, having for their object the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism.

Meanwhile, until the workers arrive at that stage in the development of their knowledge of their own position in Society, which we Socialists term "class-consciousness," the Socialists must carry on the work of education and agitation, to help in producing that knowledge or consciousness of the fact that their misery and poverty is due to one class in Society owning all the means of life—as the land, machinery, factories, railways, etc., and the wealth when it is produced—while the working class owns only the energy, ability or power to work—inseparable from the workers themselves—which they have to sell day by day or week by week, in order to obtain the necessities of life.

With every improvement in machinery, with every fresh application of chemistry and science to industry,—as for example the introduction of concrete-steel construction with relation to our own trade—the number of workers required to produce a given amount of wealth, or number of articles, continually decreases. We thus get the apparent paradox that while the amount of wealth produced increases the amount of unemployment increases also.

This antagonism of material interests causes a struggle to arise over the share which each is endeavouring to obtain of the wealth produced. And the only way out of this vicious circle is for the working-class to recognise this opposition of interest between themselves—the producers—and the capitalist class—the appropriators—and to end this intolerable system by taking hold of the means of life to be owned and controlled by the workers in their social capacity.

There can be no crying of peace where only the conditions of war exist, and any assistance given to the capitalist class, either politically or economically, is a direct injury to the working class.

When Mr. Barnes assisted the employers on the Clyde in driving the men back to work by refusing strike pay and threatening expulsion from the A.S.E.—although the men had twice voted for a strike to enforce their demands—then he showed that either from ignorance or intention he was helping to perpetuate capitalism, and therefore the evil effects, to our class, that it produces.

When Mr. Barnes and his Executive accepted the proposition of the employers on the East Coast that piece-work should be introduced—merely another name for intensified sweating—another direct injury was inflicted upon the workers for the benefit of the employers.

When running for the Blackfriars division of Glasgow, Mr. Barnes played for and obtained Liberal capitalist support at the last General Election, although the constitution of the L.R.C. forbids these alliances and bargains, thus deceiving the working class by joining hands with their enemy. Although he is quite aware that the average age at which the workers die is 29

to 30 years, yet he proposed in the House of Commons to give the workers Old Age Pensions of 5/- per week at 65 years of age—that is, sufficient to buy bread and butter, but not clothing and shelter, 35 years after most of them are dead!

To appear upon any platform with this person—except to denounce him for the misleader he is—would be nauseating to any man acquainted with the facts and understanding the Socialist position, unless he were out playing the same game.

These are my reasons for refusing to speak at the Engineers' Meeting at Ipswich, which, except as stated above, could have only acted to the injury of our members and the working class in general.—Yours fraternally,

J. FITZGERALD.

PARTY NOTES.

The Delegate Meeting will be held at the Communist Club on Saturday, 13th July at 3 p.m. Important business will be brought before it, and a full attendance of delegates is requested.

Full particulars were promised last month of the correspondence that has passed between the Tottenham Branches of the S.P.G.B. and the I.L.P. The *Tottenham Herald* has since published the correspondence. Our branch challenged the I.L.P. to debate the proposition: "Does the I.L.P. deserve the support of the working class?" Two of their local champions had expressed their willingness to meet a representative of this Party on the question, but the branch replied: "Your challenge to debate the claims of the I.L.P. to the support of the working classes duly came before the branch for consideration at our business meeting. I am instructed to inform you that our platform is open to you, or to anyone else who disagrees with us, and that you will be treated with consideration and courtesy at any of our meetings. In view, however, of the extravagant and slanderous statements made by your Tottenham speakers, we cannot see our way to meet you further. Furthermore, we suggest that it would be more honest and straightforward if, instead of allowing irresponsible spokesmen to bring the whole Socialist movement into disrepute by a policy of abuse and misrepresentation, you were to publish in your Journal the charges you bring against us, so that we should know definitely what your Party was prepared to support, and what we were expected to reply to."

The Tottenham S.P.G.B. said: "I am instructed to acknowledge receipt of your letter in which you decline our challenge to debate. Your reference to the 'working classes' is typical of that looseness of expression, or ignorance, or both, which characterises the utterances of so many of the members of the I.L.P. May I remind you that there are but two classes—the working class and the master class. This branch is unaware of any 'extravagant and slanderous' statements having been made by our speakers. We ask you to name the occasions, the speakers, and the essence of the alleged statements. The charge that we bring against the I.L.P. is that it is not worthy the support of the working class. We have given the evidence in the manifesto of the S.P.G.B., and month by month, in the columns of *THE SOCIALIST STANDARD*. . . . If we are pursuing a 'policy of abuse and misrepresentation' why not meet us in debate and expose us? Your failure to do so will be accepted by the public as evidence that you cannot justify your position, and that you know our charge is true."

A reply to this communication is already somewhat overdue!

Up to the date of going to press the first instalment of the discussion on Trade Unionism had not been received from the advocates of Industrial Unionism.

K.

THE BAKERS' AGITATION.

WHY THE MANCHESTER STRIKE MUST FAIL.

There is probably no "skilled" section of the working class in a more hopeless plight than the Operative Bakers. All the forces of bestialization seem to be focussed upon that unhappy craft. Withdrawn from all social intercourse with his fellows, and from home life, by the continuous nightwork system, beginning his week's work early on Sunday evening (I have heard men sworn at for not being in soon enough to allow the boss and his family to be in time for Chapel), sweating far into the next day, he comes home exhausted, takes a fitful and feverish sleep, and repeats the process daily until Friday, when he must start several hours earlier and work several hours later in order to make bread in one night for two days. The work is not only physically exhausting, but the nervous strain is great. He sees the dough in warm weather "moving" faster than he can cope with it to keep it sweet. If the temperature suddenly falls during the night, or (as is often the case in these days of faked ingredients) the yeast deteriorates, it is "on the green side," and he goes in fear of a "slamming" if the vans have to wait, or if the loaf has to weigh two pounds to be big enough for sale.

In the factories the hours are usually shorter, but the nervous strain is even greater. The speed is much faster and the work oftentimes more laborious. The operative's job is much less secure, as he can be discharged without notice. The wages in both cases work out at less per hour than that of the general labourer, the trade union rate, which few receive, being only 28s. per week of 60 hours for table hands. He therefore does not receive the means of subsistence for himself, a wife and family. Under such inhuman conditions it is certain that the spirit of revolt would be engendered in all those not sunk in the torpor of despair, but alas! the operative baker's spirit of revolt does not take definite shape. He has no money to buy books, no opportunity to confer with his fellows; the mental atrophy resulting from many hours of night labour in the hot, fetid atmosphere of the bakery (I have worked in an atmosphere of over 100 degrees Fah.) make him the sport of those execrable creatures, the palate-tickling, self-seeking Labour leaders.

The baker's spirit of revolt is manifesting itself at the present time in Manchester, and there are threats of a strike unless certain demands preferred by the operatives are conceded. Let us see what a strike in the baking industry means, and why it must entail, not only the suffering incidental to every strike, but also starvation for the women and children and bitter disappointment for the operatives.

In the first place I will briefly recall the London '89 strike as it is called, the last great strike in our industry, and which our "leaders" claimed as the most successful strike since the amalgamation of the small unions. After a long agitation the London men finally decided to come out, a manifesto was sent to the masters and copies posted on the hoardings; and on a given date all the men handed in a copy of the union's terms for the signature of their respective employers. If these terms were not accepted the men gave a week's notice. Many employers gave in, and the result was that these engaged a few extra men and supplied those masters who stood out with bread for their customers in cases where a sufficiency of blacklegs could not immediately be obtained. We thus had the edifying spectacle of union men blacklegging their striking brethren. London did not lose a single day's bread supply. The displaced operatives received strike pay for some weeks, and paraded the streets carrying "peels" draped with crepe, headed by a brass band which played the Dead March and other sloppy sentimental drivel outside the non-union shops until the funds were exhausted, mainly through the refusal of those in work to pay strike levies, and dropping out of the union.

Meanwhile the masters were active. They immediately substituted quick-working distillers' yeast for the old fashioned bread-sweetening but slow-working "thick" and "compo" yeasts; the "straight" dough system was adopted in lieu of the ferment and sponge system. More

machinery was introduced, factories sprang up, or were enlarged, the unemployed grew larger, with the inevitable result of longer hours and less pay for those employed. And in less than a year conditions were even worse than before, excepting in a few instances, mostly factories.

I myself, rather than submit to the conditions my pious employer tried to enforce, threw up my job and walked about for weeks looking for work, spent the accumulations of my thrift in advertising, and was finally glad to accept a job at 22s. and bed per week of upwards of 90 hours. My bed was a fifth share of a room over the flour loft, in which we cooked and smoked. One corner of the room was the office of a city gent rejoicing in the name Pierpoint & Co., and there were other occupants of the room whom we did not individualize, but referred to by the generic name of "mahogany backs." This was six months after our "successful" strike in that year of successful strikes, 1889.

Shortly after this there occurred an incident which revealed two facts to the alert capitalist. In North London a master baker and publican was a member of the local vestry, and in his capacity as guardian of the public health, led the opposition to a builders' sundriesman constructing lavatories in the basements of some buildings he was erecting. The sundriesman tried various ways to bring our baker "to his senses," without avail. He then played his trump card and threatened to ruin the baker, and this is how he proceeded. He took a shut-up shop in close proximity to the baker's, went to a local factory owner and arranged to have an unlimited supply of bread, engaged a cashier and counter-men, fitted up the shop and opened it for the sale of bread at a penny per quarter lower than the lowest cutter in that "bread-eating neighbourhood." People came from all the surrounding districts with flour bags, baskets, etc., to fetch bread for themselves and friends, policemen were stationed at the shop door to regulate the crowd, who filed in, made their purchases, and went out through the back entrance. The bakers in the factory were working at break-neck speed, at piece wages, their wrists swollen and bandaged with excessive moulding. The baker vestryman was "brought to his senses," and many others were driven out of theirs and compelled to call a meeting of their creditors, while the factory-owner and the builder made a profit. Less than a year ago the victor, who now lives in affluence, told me he did well over the "deal." This incident revealed to the factory-owner the number of sacks of flour that could be turned into bread per man in a week. The speed was maintained, but wages reverted to the normal night wages. The more alert capitalist was quick to see the possibilities of machinery, and that a practically unlimited supply of bread could be turned out with its aid and that of a few skilled bakers, and by drawing on the ever increasing army of "unskilled" labourers. He saw the economic advantage he thus obtained, and that the possibility of a successful strike of London bakers was gone for ever. Indeed, the improvement and development of machinery in the baking industry has proceeded at such a pace that it is well known by live bakers that a very large proportion of the work now done in bakeries could be done by unskilled labour, which would be immediately introduced should the operatives force up their wages by any means.

And in the event of a strike the general foremen with one or two blacklegs to supervise the weighing of yeast and salt, the tempering tank, the pitching of flour, etc., and with the assistance of engineers, supplied by the engineering firms, to superintend and work the dough mixers, dividing and moulding machines, regulate the heat of the ovens and draw the plate, could turn out all the bread that was required. Unskilled labour could easily do the rest. The result would not perhaps be the highly finished commercial loaf of to-day, but bread equal in quality to that at present sold. In no trade has technical knowledge been rendered valueless so quickly as in that of bread making, and the factories are fast scooping the trade. Everything is working in their favour, and a rise in wages, shortening of the hours of labour, the abolition of night work, or any other possible reform would give the factory a further economic advantage over the handicraft bakery and the operative.

In 1889 the masters were not organised as they are now. Every district has its local association, while 90 per cent. of the bakers in urban districts are in the National Association. It will be an easy matter then to get the output of the 700 striking operatives in Manchester made in the various factories and conveyed to Manchester in a little over four hours, even from London. Sectional strikes are hopeless in all trades, but in the case of the bakers are madness. There is no hope for us under the capitalist system of production. We must trust to ourselves alone, cease to look up to leaders or appeal to politicians, organise ourselves politically and industrially, not in vain attempts to palliate or relieve our conditions, but to end them.

That trade union leaders do not understand the working-class position and are not to be trusted is evidenced by their public utterances, their miserable failure in the House of Commons, the insipid twaddle with which they decorate the title pages of rule books ("Defence, not Defiance," "For the Good of All," etc.), their dining and wining with, and cringing sycophancy in the presence of, the enemy's leaders. That they do not understand the position is the most charitable construction that can be put upon their conduct. If they understand, acting as they do, they must be frauds. On the other hand the capitalist does understand the economic position, does recognise the incessant class war being waged, does fight scientifically, with all the logic of brutal warfare. He gives no quarter and allows no scruples, no appeals to his humanity to thwart him in his one object and ethic, the complete domination of the working class, the securing to himself an ever increasing share of the wealth produced by our labour. I therefore appeal to the Manchester men before engaging in a suicidal sectional strike, to reconsider their position and what a defeat must mean to them, what a long fight must mean to their wives and children. Even supposing a long fight were possible, is the objective worth the struggle? While capitalism lasts the capitalist must come out on top. Our emancipation can only come by the complete overthrow of the system of production for profit, and the establishment of the Co-operative Commonwealth.

W. WATTS.

ON BUYING OUT THE CAPITALIST.

[From "The Concentration of Wealth" by Henry Laurence Call, a paper read before the American Association for the Advancement of Science, at Columbia College, New York, Dec. 1906.]

The purchase of public utilities from the corporations is, indeed, now generally advocated; and we presume the same alternative will be proposed with regard to the trusts, when the people shall have become thoroughly aroused as to what they mean, as also to the futility, as well as the inadequacy, of all attempts to curb or smash them. But this acknowledges the right in these corporations to insist upon such terms as they please, or even absolutely to refuse to sell until their franchises and privileges shall have expired; thus postponing indefinitely, and rendering practically null, any attempt at a real remedy. The proposition is, moreover, in any just estimate, deliciously ludicrous. The simplicity of the countryman who "locked the stable door after the horse was stolen," was sage wisdom by comparison. It is as though that countryman, with the thief parading his stolen horse in his plain sight, should have hypnotised himself into the belief that the possession of that thief was evidence of property, and sacred; and while still in that hypnotic state, should have proposed to mortgage his farm and future labour in order to purchase back his stolen property.

If, through the misconduct of their public servants, the people have been defrauded of the possession of their public highways, as also of industry itself, then their right to repossess themselves of these properties and franchises is the same as that of the individual to repossess himself of his property, whether lost or stolen. The deprivations and wrongs of the past can never be remedied; and all the wealth that has thus far gone to supply the lavish and sinful waste of these arch plunderers of the industrial world may not be restored to the people; but

all the plundered wealth that yet remains, including the franchises and properties, is theirs to recover and possess.

To attempt such purchase would, indeed, entail upon industrial society an impossible burden.

It is stated that the income of John D. Rockefeller is 72,000,000 dollars per year. If this is true, then the wealth of that individual alone, judged by its earning power, is to-day not far from 2,500,000,000 dollars; and before any reform can be effected will undoubtedly be 3,000,000,000 dollars. Now, inasmuch as the net earnings of the whole (American) people are only 3,000,000,000 dollars per annum, it would require all the earnings of all the people of the nation for a whole year, to satisfy the demands of this one individual alone, in the event of such purchase. But he is only one of thousands of the enormously rich; and the class, of which he is representative, possess practically ninety per cent. of the 106,000,000,000 dollars given as our national wealth. Not all the labour of all the people would, then, suffice; . . . as well might a slave, all whose toil belongs to an absolute master, hope to purchase its freedom, as industrial society to undertake such purchase, and then hope even to lighten its debt burden.

Aside from the contradiction it implies, and the hardship it must entail, the purchase by society of these possessions would perpetuate an aristocracy of wealth, having no occupation but the search for pleasure and power, and quite as formidable then as now. It would take all the profits from production and industry, leaving the whole of industrial society in the future, as at present, but "hewers of wood and drawers of water" for these lords of the industrial world. It would convert this into an immense corruption fund, in the hands of an idle class trained to ambition and power. Many might be content with this perpetual mortgage upon the labour of the whole nation, and spend their incomes upon pleasure; but who can doubt that the great lords of finance who now dominate the industrial world, would still thirst for power, and, conversant with all the corrupt methods of our politics, would use the same criminal methods to build up a newer power, as those employed to build up their present possessions and power?

Besides, such half-way action, or compromise, would be as wrong and unjust as it would be impolitic. All these possessions have been created alone by the labour of industrial society; and to it, and it alone, they justly belong.

If, therefore, these possessions have found their way into the hands of the present possessors through unjust laws, through bribery, corruption, fraud, and other criminal misconduct, which the people could not see or prevent, then the people cannot do less than demand a full return both of the properties and all the accumulated wealth therefrom. Their right to this wealth is exactly commensurate with their right to take possession of the properties themselves. The return of the goods of which they have been despoiled is quite as important and altogether as just, as the prevention of further spoliation. It is enough that they have been so long defrauded of their just possessions, and compelled to toil in the service, and at the dictation, of the wrongful appropriators; without assuming this voluntary and dangerous additional burden of perpetual toil, in order to come into possession of their own again, or rather into what would be but a hollow mockery of that possession. This wealth, thus plundered from a nation's toil, either belongs to these plunderers or to the society from which they have plundered it; and to one or the other it must go in the end. Industrial society must make its choice between the two horns of the dilemma; it must be the judge of its own rights, as also the enforcer of its own decrees; and from its decision there is no appeal, as no recourse from its action.

The corporation, then, in all its ramifications, industrial, financial, and public service, should be taken from under the control of private interests, and made co-operative in the workers, by them to be administered for the common good; it should be, in fact, a social, not a selfish institution.

The receipt of a copy of this paper is an invitation to subscribe.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, subscriptions for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, articles, correspondence and advertisements submitted for insertion therein should be addressed.—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 22, Great James Street, London, W.C., to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD is published on the first day in each month.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office every Tuesday at 7 p.m.

Terms of Subscriptions.

UNITED KINGDOM.		
Twelve Months	...	1s. 6d.
Six Months	...	9d.
AMERICA.		
Twelve Months	...	50 cents.
Six Months	...	25 cents.

Scale of Charges for Advertisements.

	£	s.	d.
Per Inch, One Insertion	...	0	2
Quarter Column do.	...	0	5
Half Column do.	...	0	10
One Column do.	...	1	0

Special arrangements will be made for Advertisements to be inserted in more than one issue.

The Socialist Standard,



SATURDAY, JULY 1, 1907.

The Curse of Work:
The Right to Live.

THE Labour Party will soon need to cry "Save us from our friends"! The other "Leaders" who failed to secure election are turning upon them.

Mr. Russell Smart, in the columns of the *Labour Leader*, asserts that, since the General Election, they have lost ground because of the "tame and unheroic policy the Labour Party has followed in the House of Commons; in the eyes of the electorate it has scarcely justified its existence."

But what does Mr. Smart expect? The Labour members cannot go beyond the people who elected them. As these people were not Socialists, in some cases as at Leicester, Halifax, etc., avowed Liberals, the Labour members can do no more than ordinary Liberals would do. Surely Mr. Smart does not expect them to sacrifice any of their respectability by making themselves unpleasant in the House of Commons. It's much more to their liking to stomp the country telling the people how they "love" the Liberal Leader and how "gratified" they are at the measures which the Government introduce.

And does Mr. Russell Smart know where he is? It would appear not. He rightly asserts that to get public support and enthusiasm the Party must have something worth fighting for (assuming they desire to fight, which we doubt). As he says "the people will rally to a 'Cause'; they will remain cold to a policy." What is the "Cause" that is to rally them? The Social Revolution? Oh, no! All that is suggested is that the Party could rally to its support the whole Labour world, organised and unorganised alike, by putting into concrete form the "great and inspiring idea"—the Right to Work!

No wonder Mr. Ramsay MacDonald describes Labour Party Politics as a "confused jumble of futilities."

The God-given Curse.

The Right to Work! In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread. So runs the "God-given curse." And in the twentieth century, "when Labour is awakening to a sense of its power and responsibility," its attention and efforts are to be concentrated on the Right to Work!

In the dining room of the House of Commons, in the luxurious saloons of the Carlton Restaurant, the Pavilion, the Poplar, the Trocadero, and the Mansions of the West End, word is to be conveyed to those who "toil not, neither do they spin," that the Labour Party is anxious that the "right" of the wealth-producers to work shall be conceded by Act of Parliament; that the separation of the master class from the working

class shall be even more legally recognised; that it shall be by law enacted that the working class have the "right" to work, as distinguished from the master class, which has the "right" to enjoy the good things of life without toil, and over the "apples and nuts," over the wine and cigars, the master class and its parasites will smile the smile of smug satisfaction, and drink the health of that, from their point of view, beneficent institution, the Labour Party.

Many years ago when, at the behest of the "leaders" the unemployed were—as they are doing now—praying to spooks, following priests, petitioning kings, appealing to politicians, looking to leaders,—anything but relying upon themselves, a demonstration was held in Trafalgar Square. On the plinth was Mr. Ben Tillett, amongst others. With broad-brimmed hat covering the top of his face, with coat collar (it was winter) turned up and covering the bottom part of his face, he bellowed: "To-day we demand the right to work, next year we will demand the right to live." Why wait until next year, he was asked, but did not reply. And to-day, ten years after, the same old fraud is being put forward as a "Cause,"—the Right to Work.

The Evil of Compromise.

Could we have a better illustration of the evil of compromise? If the people have any right to live, they have it now, not next year or at any future time.

And what does the "Right to Work" mean, under Capitalism? The unemployed are to be put to work, in accordance with an Act of Parliament which the Labour Party is to get passed. Is there not already sufficient wealth produced to satisfy the needs of every member of the community? There is enough wasted every night to feed all who lack food. It is therefore evident that what is required is not more work, but a sensible distribution of present work and the wealth already produced. This fact, however, seems to be ignored by our "Right to Work" friends.

If the "Right" of the working class to work is conceded by Act of Parliament, to what work are the unemployed to be put? Already there is produced not only as much as there is an effective demand for but in many cases more. If, therefore, those not required by the capitalist "organisers" of industry are put to work under the usual conditions as to hours, etc., their product must tend to glut the market and, competing with the product of other factories, involve some capitalists in loss and throw other men out of employment. Does Mr. Smart expect the capitalists to pass a measure providing for this?

If, on the other hand, they are to be put to work producing only those things which they require for their own use, the necessary hours of labour would be so very few that the working class would recognise the extent to which they are robbed by the master class and—the capitalists' game would be up. The master class are quite aware of this, and are not to be caught in this direction.

Useless Work.

Work will only be provided by a capitalist government for those of the unemployed who make themselves objectionable, and menace capitalist property. When it is found, it will consist mainly of the useless kind—digging holes and filling them up again.*

What the unemployed and all other folks want is food, and also clothing and shelter. That these can be obtained by some individuals without working for them no one can dispute. We object to any able-bodied person obtaining them without doing his share of the necessary labour, but seeing that they can be so obtained, the unemployed have as great a right to obtain them in that way as the members and parasites of the master class. Let the unemployed throw over the misleaders who urge them to appeal to their masters to find them work. Let them recognise that only the common ownership of the means of life will solve their problem and proceed to convert their fellows. Pending the conscious effort of the working class that shall establish the Socialist Commonwealth, let the unemployed determine that they will not starve.

When our Right to Live is conceded we are prepared to recognise our obligation to perform our share of the necessary labour, but not till then. Let our rallying cry be "Down with the 'Right to Work': Up with the 'Right to Live.'"

* In his pamphlet, "The Right to Work," Mr. Russell Smart urges that the unemployed should be set to stone-breaking as a labour test.

A MIDDLE-CLASS UTOPIA.

MODERN THRALDOM.—A New Social Gospel, by Dr. W. Hampson, M.A. London: Wells Gardner, Darton & Co. Paper covers, 162 pp., 1s. 6d. net.

The early portion of this book describes the servitude into which "borrowed" tools, houses, and land are supposed to have thrown the "labouring classes," the "clean clothes classes," and also the tradesmen, small manufacturers, and farmers. The evidence in the book, however, really shows that the poverty of the workers and the crushing of the small capitalists are due to the concentration of wealth and industry into fewer hands turning increasing numbers into propertyless hirelings of the possessing few. But to put it thus involves Socialism as the solution, so our author prefers to attribute the situation not to the inevitable march of industrial development, but simply to credit in some form or other.

The most interesting part of the book is that dealing with agriculture, where many reasons are given for the decrease in number and increase in size of farms, but where the most important reasons such as the development of agricultural machinery which cannot profitably be employed on small farms, the general economies of operations on a large scale, and the development of the machinery of transport which brings other climes into more acute competition, are missed. This, however, is of a piece with the fact that Dr. Hampson nowhere realises the force of the economic trend.

From his point of view of the small property-holder, the author is much troubled by the question of the rates, but his own evidence shows it to be a question that does not concern the workers or even the tenant farmer. He says, p. 46:—

At the time of the great depression in land values and profits from land, it became impossible for farmers to continue paying their former rents, and a percentage was remitted in most cases, so as to bring the amount payable each half-yearly rent day just within the limits of the possible. If a season were exceptionally bad, so as to involve the farmers in inevitable loss, a larger percentage of rent would be remitted. If times improved in some way, the remission would be less. Thus when the Agricultural Rating Act was passed, to relieve the farmers of a portion of their rates, a smaller percentage of rent was remitted the next half year.

The middle class of course has its schisms and the author tilts against modern radicalism and against that municipal enterprise which is such a blessing to many middle-class investors, and also against the officialism that provides easy positions for their sons; but Dr. Hampson's attitude is nevertheless essentially that of the class between the devil and the deep blue sea. He protests against rings and combines, but is specially vehement against working-class trade organisations, and states that trade union action, by restricting free competition in labour "means a reduction of wages and in the standard of living," while on p. 28 it is further urged that:—

All combining, negotiating, organised advising and warning, striking, picketing, and other proceedings intended to restrict the freedom of the labour market, ought to be regarded and treated as criminal, so as to restore complete freedom to the man who wants to sell labour and to the man who wants to buy it.

There is also on p. 12 a curious defence of the exploitation of labourers—exploitation by the middle class of course. It is stated that the shareholders having the necessary plant and materials or equivalent wealth:—

Lent them to the officials and working men and women of the factory, on condition that the latter, having borrowed them and worked with them, should pay to the lenders a part of the profits earned by their labour, namely, all that was over after they had been paid a subsistence wage depending, among other conditions, on the recognised minimum standard of living in the district at the time. Now this was a perfectly open bargain, well understood by all the parties to it, and the shareholders, who in fact lent the factory and appliances, have a right to claim that they shall not have hard words thrown at them, as capitalists, because they are taking a part of the profit earned by other men's labour.

In the description of the Utopia that is expected to follow the adoption of the author's suggestions there is nothing but glorified middle-class conditions, with the middle class predominant in wealth and power. It is prohibited to live in hired rooms and houses, and all credit is forbidden except the capital of limited liability companies, of which all shareholders are required to be also occupied in connection with their company, while no shareholder may own

more than five times the smallest allotment of shares. A kind of Single Tax is instituted (in spite of the author's ideal of free internal trade) in the nature of a poundage on every cash transaction. This tax (which the author says is not a tax, and which is to be levied without officials) is to enable the one man government to supply such of the citizens as have deposited £250 in the State Bank, with a further £250 on their marriage for the purpose of buying house, furniture and allotment. There are to be no boards, committees, councils or parliament. National government is to be run by an elected president and local administration by a manager; while no one can vote unless he owns, among other things, a bicycle!

There is still to be wage-slavery in the new Utopia, but the workmen are supposed to be able to get higher wages through the absence of trade organisations, and through being forbidden to hire rooms, so having to buy a room or rooms outright. The labourer is to give six hours industrial labour per day and put in the rest of his time on the land. The thrashing, winnowing and grinding of corn is to be done at home in small hand machines because:

However little it may cost to grind in a steam driven mill, it costs less to do it at home in the time that used to be spent in the evening at a public house. It costs nothing at all, but actually saves the money that was once spent in drinking to while away the time.

How typically middle class!

Even the great domestic servant question is almost solved in this Utopia. The author says:

And are mistresses no longer the slaves of their servants?

In this respect also there is great improvement. We have now no large class of excessively rich, keeping large houses full of "pampered menials," and so setting before other servants a false standard of lavishness, luxury, ease, pilfering, and "perks." On the other hand the middle-class ladies, having given up imitating the luxury of the rich, have themselves become as good practical housekeepers as their husbands are practical business men and cultivators. They can, if need be, manage their houses in many cases without outside help, and so, when they have that help they know how to keep, without petty domineering, the position of mistress in their own homes.

The Doctor's Utopia illustrates both how completely class interests as they are recognised mould a man's views, and how narrow is the mental vision of the middle class.

For the realisation of this Utopia an association called the Land and Labour League is to be formed and to be endowed by a few charitably disposed millionaires for the purchase of property, the tenure of which is to be sold to League members who in turn are not allowed to give any of their property as security for a loan. Leaguers will pay "no rates or taxes," these will be paid by the League out of proceeds of a receipt stamp tax to be levied on all members.

The League, says the author, is to be a co-worker with the garden city schemes at Bourneville, Port Sunlight, York, Letchworth and other places, so it is very small beer after all.

The League will, when funds allow, put £250 to the selected member's on his marriage for the purchase of house and grounds that are to remain technically the property of the League—a sort of glorified building society in fact that is supposed to grow snowball like, until it absorbs the whole of Society.

But what of the working man? How is he to save the necessary £250 in order to participate in this paradise? The author has told us that to-day "The lowest salary which will supply the bare living must be accepted by each applicant lest another cut in and take the place," also that "conditions make it practically impossible for an average man to rise out of the labouring ranks in which he was born."

The odds therefore appear to be rather long against the workers being able to save the requisite £250 each, indeed, they do not stand even an outside chance. But the author of the "New Social Gospel" has a most simple plan. It is to tax immigrants heavily and put an almost prohibitive tax on imports. Then, says the doctor:

When all the production for the English market is secured for the English producer, there will be for a time an era of prosperity seldom equalled before. Demand will overtake supply for a time. The price of labour will rise higher than ever before, the unemployed, and under such tempting conditions, many even of those who are now unemployable, will be earning money; and the workers being rich, the prices of common articles will rise also, though not in the same proportion as wages.

Truly a simple plan—for simpletons. The workman knows that labour-power is the last to participate in a rise in prices, so that the problematic rise in wages will not be proportionate to the rise in general prices. The worker will also see that if prices rise, then the price of house and land rises also, thus the amount to be saved rises proportionately, leaving the possibility to the workman of saving at least as remote as before.

Further, restricted immigration is no new thing, and where instituted has made no appreciable difference to the workers. It is not the alien, but capitalist development that creates the unemployed, and the same process is going on in every country; new inventions and processes, greater concentration and more efficient organisation decrease daily the proportion of wage workers required by the masters to produce for the market. Large numbers of workers are thus thrown on the streets while the owners of the instruments and materials of labour reap the whole of the benefit.

And with regard to a prohibitive import tax, owing to the very nature of international exchange, the import trade of the country cannot be destroyed without causing havoc in the export trade and the consequent ruin (under capitalist conditions) of those producing for export. We have also object lessons the whole world over of the futility of fiscal juggling as far as the workers are concerned. Capitalist conditions breed working-class poverty everywhere, and must do so long as the workers are the hirelings of the possessing few. But even supposing that by some miracle all wage slaves managed to save £250 and so live rent free; is it not a fact that capitalism (whether under small or large manufacturers) turns the very thrift and temperance of the workers into weapons of offence against them? and does not Dr. Hampson himself prove this? Speaking of allotments he says:

Suppose the profits from a plot of land to be equal to two shillings a week. Then a man and his family can live in the same moderate degree of comfort as before on a wage of fourteen shillings instead of sixteen if need be.

It is the professed object of the promoters of improvement on these lines that the improvement shall become general. Suppose them to succeed to the full extent of their hopes. Suppose that practically all the labourers increase their wages by such means to the equivalent of eighteen shillings, so that they could, in case of necessity, continue their present style of living on an actual money wage of fourteen shillings. The farmers would not be long in making the discovery that their labourers were able to live on two shillings a week less. And the next week they would require their men to prove their ability.

Such, indeed, is the mainspring of the welcome that has greeted the present Liberal Small Holdings Bill. And its undeniable truth destroys at one blow Dr. Hampson's Utopia as far as the workers are concerned. Whatever cheapens the cost of living of the workman, as soon as it becomes general, reduces his wage, competition compelling him to sell himself for a mere subsistence. Yet Dr. Hampson dares to say that if the worker did not have to pay rent he would be enabled to exact a higher wage! The small capitalist is essentially reactionary, and his only possible ideal is one that runs counter to every economic tendency. And our author, voicing the interests and ideals of this class, has reckoned without his host, the financial magnate, who now rules the capitalist roost, and without, also, the army of the workers, who can only go forward, to industrial democracy—not backward, to the infancy of capitalist society. Unlike the middle class intellectuals, the scientific Socialist has outgrown the Utopian stage. Our author, however, evidently imagines that men figure the society they want and then make it to order; so he thinks that if the public find his Utopia good they will set themselves to make one like it. The scientific Socialist does not erect a fanciful Utopia, but analyses actual Society, its economics and its history, and tracing its laws of development sees whether the basic factor, the development of wealth production, tends, and derives therefrom, not a detailed picture of the future, but the broad direction of economic evolution and the essential principles of the society foreshadowed by the present. And by the study of men's actions, motives and history, he is enabled to discover the essential principles of the action that must be taken to render the transition speedy and beneficial.

Dr. Hampson has not done this, therefore his reforms are upon all counts a snare and delusion to the middle class in their struggle against the inevitable, while to the working class they offer at best nothing but a shuffling of masters by no means to the better. F.C.W.

INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY.

THE logic of events has altered somewhat the character of the opposition that is made to the Socialist. He is now seldom told that the personal management of the capitalist is essential to the working of industry, for it is precisely those concerns in which the personal supervision of the capitalist is lacking that are driving the personally managed businesses to the wall.

It is acknowledged that the small master man has every year an increasing difficulty in making his way in the world. Each year sees an enormous number of bankruptcies, largely among the personally managed businesses, and each year sees private businesses turned into companies, and companies combined into rings, cartels, and trusts. The reason for this is not far to seek.

It is only the small businesses that can in any real sense of the word be said to be personally directed, and the small concern is in a parlous way beside the great public company. The large firm is able to considerably reduce the proportion of management expenses by distributing them over a larger volume of work. It is also able to extend the division of labour and to introduce and suitably employ the most efficient machinery. It is able to buy in large quantities and therefore more cheaply; to make consignment of goods in bulk and therefore at lower rates; and in many ways both in buying and in selling to overreach its smaller rival.

Though the working capitalist resort to sweating methods of the worst kind and work his men long hours and use all the petty tricks of trade, yet he can rarely successfully compete with the great company that makes profit for owners who know nothing of the processes and who take no part in the labour involved.

The sweating underground master-baker is out-competed by the eight hours day machine bakery. The struggling tobacconist, tea dealer, and the like are being crushed by the branches of the great distributing trusts. The small cycle maker is losing ground before the great Coventry companies, and on all sides a similar process is going on. The number of trusts in this country is already very great, and their number grows apace. And this fact, though it sounds the knell of the middle class, rings nevertheless with the promise of deliverance for those who toil.

It means that associated production is vastly more efficient and economical than individual or small scale wealth production. It demonstrates that the personal supervision of the capitalist is unnecessary to the carrying on of industry. It means that the workers run the main industries of the country, though it is true that they now do so for others' gain.

In the company and trust, some of the black-coated proletariat are hired and placed in positions of authority; the manager is given a larger salary and perhaps a percentage on the profits in order that his interests may be more closely identified with those of his masters, the capitalist class, rather than with those of his dusty coated brethren; but nevertheless the fact remains that the most efficient concerns are run by proletarian hirelings and the profits are handed over by them to the idle and useless owners of the plant.

The growth of company and trust each year demonstrates more plainly the uselessness of the capitalist. The working class now runs industry to its own misery for the profit of its oppressors, but the day is near when it should take those industries that have been built up with its blood and sweat and transform them from means of profit for a handful of parasites into the means of its deliverance from slavery and degradation. The economic foundation is being laid, and as industry after industry ripens to the trust stage, so approaches the time when those who labour, having driven their exploiters from the political entrenchments, must seize the industrial machinery their labour has created and use it for the well-being of all. W.

An Open Letter to Robert Blatchford.

WANTED—A PARTY.

My Dear Robert,—If it isn't a rude question, where have you been living for the past three years? I did hear you had been in London most of the time, but I can hardly credit that. Unless, indeed, you have "sporting the oak" of your reading room to the exclusion of all information from the outside world. But that can't be, for I have observed articles from your pen on current topics. You must have kept in communication with London affairs, and as you call yourself a Socialist, I take it you have kept touch with the Socialist movement in London. Or relied upon somebody to keep you in touch. If so, if you have relied upon somebody, he has let you down and made you look silly. He has made you write: "We want a real Socialist Party... we have an S.D.F. and an I.L.P. and a L.R.C. and a Fabian Society; but we have not a British Socialist Party. What is to be done?"

What is to be done? Well! Had you asked me I should have answered—wake up! If I, as a London Socialist writer, said, "we have a *Justice* and a *Labour Leader* and *Daily Mail* but we have not a '*Clarion*,' you would think that my education in such matters had been neglected.

Everybody in London professing Socialism knows of the *Clarion*, and by the same token everybody in London professing Socialism knows of The Socialist Party of Great Britain, or—their education in such matters is defective.

We have not a British Socialist Party! Why, I've been a member of the British Socialist Party three years. This paper is issued by—just the Party you are enquiring for, a real Socialist Party.

And you didn't know of its existence. Oh! Robert, Robert, where have you been buried?

No, don't thank me. This is the fellowship. I confess to the greatest astonishment that you were ignorant of this good thing, but the discharging of my fellowship obligation in sending you the news calls for no thanks. Only mark that "Socialism" is not S.D.F.ism or I.L.P.ism or Fabianism or even Clarionism. They are quite different things, as we show in our "Manifesto," and in this journal. It was precisely because we had discovered that S.D.F.ism and the rest did not make for Socialism that we anticipated your desire for

A REAL SOCIALIST PARTY.

We are very emphatic on this point, and you will readily see how necessary such emphasis is. The clear duty of a real Socialist Party is to work for real Socialism. It has no justification for existence apart from that.

It is urged that conceptions as to what constitutes work for real Socialism may properly differ. Conceptions on this point among Socialists should not differ; do not, in fact. The only work a Socialist can do is to preach Socialism. He can never preach anything that conflicts with his Socialism while he remains a Socialist; for that is to obscure his Socialism and to stultify himself as a Socialist.

Suppose he becomes an advocate for Payment of Members as the S.D.F. member does, a little Women's Suffrage, after the fashion of the I.L.P.'er, Municipal Public Houses, like unto the Fabian, what then? In the first place his Socialism has receded, however temporarily, into a secondary position. Socialism is not being preached—the working class crying for bread is given—a stone. Secondly he is doing work that needs no Socialist Party at all. Thirdly the particular reform worked for will not appreciably affect the condition of the working class as such. Fourthly it will therefore have wasted the working-class strength concentrated upon realising it. Fifthly it will, because it has effected no material improvement in working-class conditions, have bred disappointment, and, from disappointment, apathy. And finally it will have made existing confusion worse confounded in the minds of the working class.

Therefore I contend that preaching Socialism and explaining the phenomena of industrial development in the light of Socialism is the proper work of a Socialist. If he does any other propaganda work he is not a Socialist.

In the issue of the *Clarion* which contained your note already quoted, you plead for the all-sufficiency of the logical method. You say "If

we overleap logic we overleap ourselves and land in a bog of confusion and disappointment," which is very true. I am all for the logical method therefore. I think that the argument I have submitted is strictly logical. If you think otherwise perhaps you will confute me.

Now will you turn to our Declaration of Principles on the back page and read it closely. It is an important pronouncement. So important that we reproduce it in every issue. It is important to you if you want a real British Socialist Party, because it is the base of the real British Socialist Party—which you will have to sign before you can realise your desire. Perhaps you will point out wherein we overleap logic.

I will anticipate one objection you may raise. It is raised by your non-Socialist S.D.F., I.L.P., F.S. and the rest. It is our statement of hostility to all other political parties.

You may think we are too narrow, too doctrinaire. You may think it an impossible position, as the others do, but is it? I ask you, Robert, to proceed with your examination logically, without regard to the feelings of members of other political parties; without concern for the probable effect upon the sale of the *Clarion*. Proceed as you did in your examination of Christianity.

We are only interested in the maintenance of truth. Truth can only be maintained inside the logical method. "If we overleap logic we overleap ourselves and land in a bog of confusion and disappointment." Therefore,—the truth, even if it means that we become for the time as voices crying in the wilderness.

The cause of working-class misery is private ownership of the means of life. The interests of the workers, who do not own the means of life, are opposed to the interests of the capitalists, who do own them. This clash of interests is the class struggle. I presume we may take that as read.

These things continue because

THE WORKING CLASS ARE IGNORANT.

Although their interests continually clash with those of their masters, they do not understand that this is inevitable. Nor do they understand that their masters' ownership of the means of life is at the bottom of the trouble. We may take this as read also.

Now why, with this continual conflict of interest, do the working class remain ignorant? And why are they so desperately apathetic? Is their ignorance not because the truth has not been told? And is their apathy not born largely of disappointment with the results of past efforts of their class to secure some amelioration of their condition?

We need not enquire for the moment into the honesty of working-class teachers and leaders. We need only deal with the teaching and leading.

The school instruction of the working class is not such as would enable the child to get a glimmering of the truth of the position. It would be surprising if the capitalist class, dominant in the Legislature (because dominance there is essential to the maintenance of their economic ascendancy) should take steps to instruct the children of the working class concerning working-class poverty. So we will consider the teaching and leading the workers receive after they have entered the industrial and political arenas.

Now do the majority of working-class teachers teach that the working-class position is inevitable under present conditions? that there is no name given under heaven whereby the working class may be saved except Socialism? that until Socialism there can be no cessation of the clash of interests between Capital and Labour?—that the class struggle persists unflaggingly?

Leave out of account those who do not claim to be Socialists. If Socialism is the only remedy, and they are not Socialists, their teaching cannot be right because they do not teach Socialism. That's agreed, I think.

But what of those who profess Socialism? My answer is that although they talk of it occasionally, they do not teach it. Nor do their leadings square with their occasional professions.

The important thing in a teacher of Socialism is that it should always be Socialism that he teaches. If he does not explain every manifestation of class conflict in the light of his Socialist philosophy, he is little, if any, better than the non-Socialist misleader. His teaching is neither logical nor consistent. He lands his audience in a bog of confusion.

And if, as very frequently happens, his actions directly conflict with his

OCCASIONAL SOCIALIST PROFESSIONS.

if he mouths the class struggle and the fundamental importance of its full appreciation, what time he is doing those things which can only obscure the appreciation of the class struggle, I submit that he can only be classified under one of two heads. Either he is a fraud or a fool.

These be hard words, Robert, but they are not bitter, for I also am a Determinist.

However, the working-class ignorance and apathy which must be dispelled before Socialism can be realised, so far from being effectively combatted by working-class leaders and teachers are contributed to by most of them. For example. If I were to tell the unemployed that unemployment must last as long as capitalism and were then to recommend them to send a deputation to the representatives of the capitalists to ask that they (the capitalists) should abolish unemployment, I should either be a knave or a fool. I should have cut myself off from logic and landed my audience in a bog of confusion and disappointment.

If I argue that capitalist representatives are in control of the political machinery to conserve their own interests as against those of the working class (as we all agree is and must be the case); and that we must regard capitalist representatives always as a hostile force against whom war must be waged unceasingly until they are utterly vanquished. And in face of that I suspend hostilities and enter into alliance with them, I overleap logic and land my followers in the bog of confusion and disappointment.

If I postulate that poverty and misery must last till Socialism, that until Socialism nothing can materially or permanently affect the position; if I say that palliatives are therefore of little use, so little use indeed that I must have a party that shall concentrate upon the thing that matters (Socialism) rather than the things that do not matter (palliatives); and if notwithstanding I secure that my organisation, founded because palliatives were not good enough, shall concentrate working-class effort upon the realisation of palliatives, I am riding rough-shod over logic and doing my level best to engulf my followers in the pit of impotence and despair.

Well, dear Robert, that is precisely what your S.D.F., I.L.P., Fabian Society, and—yes, and your *Clarion* are doing. If you want details I have told you already where you can get some. If you want a special list of

CLARIONESE FATUITIES

say the word.

You think highly of the *Clarion*, naturally. I think myself it is an excellent pen-orth too—sometimes. But it is not a Socialist paper. It is written to please those who fancy themselves "advanced" and caters for the organisations to which the "advanced" person belongs. It will give space to anything or anybody bearing one of the many recognised labels. But it won't give space to the S.P.G.B. representative who wishes to reply to a misleading reference to his Party, which is the more curious because you are enquiring for the Party.

No. THE "CLARION" IS NOT A SOCIALIST PAPER. It is a jumble,—a gorgeous, inconsistent, illogical jumble. Which wouldn't matter tuppence if it didn't help throw the workers into confusion.

But the pity of it, Robert, the pity of it! You might do good work for Socialism if only your vaunted adherence to principle was a matter of fact instead of a figment of fancy. With your fine literary sense, your faculty for the selection of the apt phrase and the illuminating quotation, the appeal of your imagery, the grace of your style—these powers might make a mighty instrument in the education of the working class. Instead of which you handle pitch and are defiled; you persist in the folly of emphasising non-essentials and scamping essentials until I begin to fear you must for ever remain a stumbling block and a rock of offence.

That's what I had in my mind when I said that having had the Socialist Party of Great Britain, the party you are enquiring for, brought to your notice, and having decided that it is the party you must apply for membership in, you must do all in your power for Socialism, as distinguished from S.D.F.ism, Clarionism, and the rest. "We are all Socialists now," quoth a certain knight now dead, and I suppose he spake as truly as he knew. Yet he was absurdly wide of the mark. Not every one who proclaims himself So-

cialist shall find place in the ranks of the Socialist army. Not those whose desire is personal aggrandisement, nor those who aspire to superintend the workers' activities, nor the experts nor the superior persons nor the palliators, nor the compromisers, nor the hosts of the otherwise damned are of the confraternity of working-class educators. Rather are they conscious and unconscious perpetrators of ignorance, workers of evil, misleaders, and false friends. But those who, understanding the working-class relation to the economy of production; understanding the forces that have been at work through all history to present in this the twentieth century that appalling anomaly of a starving people in the midst of a riot of wealth of their own creation; understanding how the physical and intellectual well-being of the workers is conditioned by the measure of their control of the means by which they live; understanding that control of these means of life can only be secured by workers similarly enlightened; those who, understanding these things and the necessity for eliminating every factor tending to confuse the issue in the working-class mind, have set themselves steadfastly to the task of translating their knowledge into clear, logical, consistent action to the end that their fellows may the more readily acquire the knowledge that shall make them free, only these are the Socialists and only these can form in England or elsewhere, the Socialist Party.

And that, Robert, is all I can say to you to-day, and I hope it will be helpful if not to you at least to some others and lead them to come over and help us. At present the labourers are few. You if you will help to make them many. If you will not, well, we must needs do without you. This is the fellowship. And so no more at present from—

Yours truly,

FILIP POPPLE.

A LOOK ROUND.

THE Trades Dispute Act, passed by a Government "having something of a Labour Party force behind it" as one jubilant Trade Unionist has expressed it, legalised peaceful picketing. That is to say it made it quite lawful for "one or more persons acting on their own behalf or on behalf of a Trade Union or of an individual employer or firm in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute to attend at or near a house or place where a person resides or works or carries on business or happens to be if they so attend merely for the purpose of peacefully obtaining or communicating information or of peacefully persuading any person to work or abstain from working."

But the question of what is peaceful picketing is of course one for the Magistrates and the Judges. In the course of a strike or lock-out, it is hardly to be expected that strikers or locked-out workers will be able to control their feelings altogether when they see their places being taken by others. The moment they get excited they can be charged under the Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act, 1875, as was the case at the Old Street Police Court on June 6th, when two men were each fined £10 and ordered to pay six guineas costs between them.

Another Act of the present Government, the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1906, comes into force on July 1st. If a workman, after that date, meet with a fatal accident, and his relatives can afford to employ lawyers, or make a bargain with them on the "no win, no pay" system, they may get a verdict of £300 against the employer. And if the latter has not insured and cannot pay, he can make himself a bankrupt, and clear himself of all obligations. No wonder the Act has been described as one for the benefit of insurance companies and lawyers more than for workmen.

Probably many of the smaller employers will regard a fatal accident to one of their workmen as a blessing in disguise if it enables them, by means of the Bankruptcy Court, to disentangle themselves from the difficult position in which

they have been forced under this competitive system.

The Stringertype is the name of a new matrix composing and casting machine recently invented by Mr. H. J. S. Gilbert-Stringer. After a close inspection by a number of experts, the machine has been found to thoroughly justify the many important advantages claimed for it by the inventor.

Another factor in the problem of men & machinery!

The chairman of Barclay, Perkins & Company, Ltd., is much afraid that "after legislation has finished with the Breweries," the "Socialists" would turn their attention to other so-called monopolies, and the property of the Church itself will be in danger! This twaddle about the wicked Socialists who would destroy property is part of the game played by the capitalist class. But Barclay, Perkins' "property," like that of other sections of the master class, may be depreciated and even destroyed in the ordinary course of capitalist development, without any "Socialist" agitation or action.

Thus at the meeting of William Cory & Son, Ltd., held on June 11th, Sir Francis Cory-Wright said they ought to put large sums to depreciation and reserve, because they could not say what in the future might take the place of coal, and render much of their assets valueless.

He went on to refer to the new invention "Coalite," to exploit which a new company was being formed. Mr. Parker, of Wolverhampton, claimed that it was absolutely smokeless, and that its use would put an end to thick fogs, which were solely due to the smoke emitted from domestic and factory chimneys. There were good grounds for this claim, and if "Coalite" proved successful it would have a great future.

As I understand it, "Coalite" is obtained by treating ordinary coal in a particular manner. But surely it is within the region of possibility that a fuel may one day be discovered superior to coal in every respect, which would at once depreciate the value of coal mines and allied industries. Then the coal mine owners would agitate for the nationalisation of coal mines and some alleged Socialists would be jubilant at the rate of progress of their ideas.

On June 12th Mr. Bicknell presided at the meeting of J. C. & J. Field, Ltd., Soap and Candle Manufacturers. He said the year had been a disappointing one. For some years the profits had been steadily growing less, owing to heavy taxation, the increased price of raw materials, in addition to excessive competition.

When the Soap Trust was operating here, Fields was one of the firms which remained outside. And when the retailers talked of forming a co-operative concern to manufacture soap against the Trust, Field's advised them not to erect a factory or to put down new plant, but, if they would subscribe £50,000 Capital, Field's plant could be utilised, etc. All this, of course, was disinterested. Field's sole desire, as everybody knew, was to help the people fight the awful Trust.

It is stated that the cause of the trouble at Vickers, Sons & Maxim's Engineering Works at Erith, was primarily the introduction of a premium bonus system, similar in many respects to the "Rowan" system. In this connection the following extract from *The Engineer-in-Charge and Works Manager for May* will be interesting to readers.

Piecework.—Each engineer must decide for himself as to whether any of the work undertaken in his department can be more cheaply turned out on a piecework basis. Many engineers have to manufacture spare parts in considerable quantities, and in these cases the work can often be done more cheaply by the piece;

the workman possibly earns more money, but the total cost will be less when establishment charges have been added.

The chief objection to piecework is the difficulty of fixing a fair rate: if too high, the workman earns very large wages and the rate has to be cut down, with the result that next time a man is given a job at a high rate he takes care not to work too quickly. To avoid this system the premium system has been introduced, which has the effect of giving part of the additional earnings to the employer and part to the workman. The method introduced by the late Mr. James Rowan has been more used than perhaps any other: by this system a man is allowed, say eight hours in which to do a certain job, and his rate is 8d. per hour; if he does the work in six hours he will be paid his ordinary rate plus 2.8ths. 2d., therefore, in this case he will get 10d. per hour. It is obviously impossible with this method, for a man to be paid double his ordinary rate, and the effect is to increase the man's bonus for small savings in time and to decrease it for large, that is compared with ordinary piecework; hence, it is unnecessary ever to cut the rate after it has once been fixed, and this system is undoubtedly useful for work for which the rate is difficult to compute.

There are no flies on the employers who adopt this system!

In the current issue of *The Contemporary Review*, Mr. L. G. Chiozza Money, M.P., deals with the Investments of the Masses. He estimates the total wealth of the United Kingdom at £11,500,000,000, of which £10,900,000,000 is owned by 5,000,000 people, and £600,000,000 by 22,000,000 of the population. Thus about 95 per cent. of the entire wealth of the United Kingdom is owned by about one-ninth of its population. It could easily be shown, he added, that of the 5,000,000 of people above the income tax line a small proportion, about one-fifth or say, 1,000,000 people about 200,000 or 250,000 families own nearly the whole of the accumulated wealth of the Kingdom, and that this small group exercise the effective government of the nation by its control of the means of production. "Those rule who own."

Those rule who own. That is the position. Whatever political reforms may be secured will be useless so long as the means of wealth production are private property. Therefore the efforts of the workers for political supremacy must be directed with the object of using the power thus obtained to effect the social revolution. Private ownership of the means of wealth production must give place to social ownership.

Some societies of working men have been led into supporting the Workers' Educational Association, which exists for the purpose of encouraging boys and girls to continue their education (of a kind agreeable to their masters) by attendance at evening schools after they have commenced to work. Last month a Conference took place between the Association and employers of labour at Birmingham, at which a committee, with the Lord Mayor as chairman, was appointed to carry out the work. The true inwardness of the movement may be gathered from the Press reports of this meeting, which conclude thus: "It was stated that the decay of the apprenticeship system had caused employers to lose that control of young people which they formerly possessed." And, of course, by the help of Mr. Albert Mansbridge and his W.E.A., they hope to get it back.

An instance of the fallacy that only unskilled workers need lack employment in this happy land arose at the City Coroner's Court on June 6th, when an inquest was held concerning the death of Harry G. Burrell, aged 59, a brass finisher, who dropped dead the previous Sunday evening in Whitecross-st. It was stated that the deceased was a capital workman, but had been unable to find regular employment for the past five years. One witness stated that he had known deceased since January and frequently during the bitter nights of February and March they would lie sodden with rain on one of the

seats of the Embankment, only to be moved on and made to walk by the first constable who came across them. Between two and three thousand homeless "heirs to glory" went to the Embankment at night.

Of course, the jury, being "practical" men, passed the usual verdict: "Death from natural causes." It is quite recognised by the capitalist class that it is perfectly "natural" for men, able and willing to work, to die of starvation in the midst of plenty.

J. KAY.

BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, &c. to be obtained of the S.P.G.B., 22, Great James St., London, E.C.

CAPITAL (Karl Marx) ... 5s. 6d.

SIX CENTURIES OF WORK AND WAGES (Thorold Rogers) ... 5s. 6d.

POVERTY (Rowntree) ... 4s. 6d.

SOCIALIST STANDARD Vols. I. & II (Bound) each 3s. 0d.

MANIFESTO and RULES of the S.P.G.B. ... 1½d.

FROM HANDICRAFT TO CAPITALISM (Kautsky) 1½d.

COMMUNIST MANIFESTO ... 2½d.

WAGE LABOUR & CAPITAL (Marx) 1½d.

JONES' BOY ... 1½d.

SOCIALISM & THE WORKER (Sorge) 1½d.

HOW I BECAME A SOCIALIST (Morris) 1½d.

THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION (Kautsky) 7½d.

ALL POST FREE.

VOL. II OF THE SOCIALIST STANDARD (Sept., 1905 to Aug., 1906.)

Well bound in cloth, gold lettered,
Post Free ... 3s. 0d.

MANIFESTO OF THE Socialist Party of Great Britain.

Second Edition, with preface, now ready.

Explains the Party's position towards the S.D.F., I.L.P., Fabian Society, Trade Unions, S.L.P., etc.

Price - - One Penny.

Post free 1½d. per copy from the S.P.G.B., 22, Great James Street, London, W.C.
The Trade supplied by Henderson, 16, Paternoster Row, London, E.C.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

HEAD OFFICE:

22, GREAT JAMES STREET, LONDON, W.C.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—A. Jones, Secretary, 3, Mathew St., Latchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at S.P.G.B., Laburnam House, 134, High Street, Battersea, S.W. Club open every evening.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Executive Committee. Applications should be sent to the General Secretary.

EAST HAM.—W. Gifford, Sec., 31, Maryland Square, Stratford. Branch meets Mondays at 7.30 at 447, Katherine Rd., Forest Gate.

EDMONTON.—Sidney Auty, Sec., 60, Gilpin Grove, Edmonton. Branch meets Wednesdays 8.30.

FULHAM.—E. Waller, Secretary, 45, Warple Way, Wandsworth, S.W. Branch meets June 3 and alternate Mondays at 8 at Ingram's Coffee Tavern, Fulham Cross.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Fri. at 8.30 at 79, Grove Rd., Holloway. Communications to the Sec.

PADDINGTON.—Communications to F. Linfield, 18, Goldney Rd., Paddington, W. Branch meets every Wednesday, 8.30 p.m., at Harley's Coffee Tavern (foot of Lock Bridge), Harrow Rd.

PECKHAM.—W. Wren, Sec., 91, Evelina Rd., Nunhead, S.E. Branch meets every Wed. at 8.30

ROMFORD DIVISION.—All communications to the Secretary, S.P.G.B. Club, 39, York Road, Ilford. Branch meets Mondays at 8 at Club.

TOOTING.—P. Dumenil, Secretary, 36, Byton Road, Tooting, S.W. Branch meets every Wed. at 8 p.m. at Goringe Dining Rooms, Goringe Park Parade, Tooting Junction.

TOTTENHAM.—T. Lobb, Sec. Branch meets Mon. 8 at p.m., at Sunbeam Coffee Tavern, High Rd.

WATFORD.—T. Wilkins, Sec., 4, Marlborough Rd., Branch meets alternate Fridays at 8 p.m.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Mondays 7.30, followed at 8.30 by discussion, at 447, Katherine Road, Forest Gate.

WOOD GREEN.—H. Crump, Secretary, 39, Hermitage Road, Harringay, N. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Mondays at 8.30 at 2, Station Road, Wood Green.

WOOLWICH & PLUMSTEAD.—A. E. Rance, Sec., 44, Brookdene Rd., Plumstead. Branch meets on 2nd and 4th Wednesdays in month at 80, Conway Road, Plumstead.

INFORMATION

concerning the Party can be obtained of the following
BRADFORD (Yorks).—Ben Wilde, 78, Godwin St.
BURTON-ON-TRENT.—J. Blundell, 157, New St.
LIVERPOOL.—J. M. O. Sullivan, 4, Laburnam Grove, Litherland.
MANCHESTER.—J. Marsh, 97, Blantyre Street, Swinton, Nr. Manchester.

TO NEWSAGENTS.

"The Socialist Standard" and all other publications of The Socialist Party of Great Britain are supplied to the trade by Henderson's, 16, Paternoster Row, London, E.C.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

HOLDS

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master-class, and the consequent enslavement of the working-class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working-class from the domination of the master-class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working-class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist-class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working-class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working-class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master-class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

APPLICATION FOR MEMBERSHIP.

To the Secretary,

.....Branch, S.P.G.B.

I hereby declare my adhesion to the above principles, and request enrolment as a member of The Socialist Party of Great Britain.

Signature.....

Address.....

Date.....

S.P.G.B. LECTURE LIST. JULY, 1907.

SUNDAYS.	7th.	14th.	21st.	28th.
Battersea, Prince's Head	11.30 H. Newman	E. Fawcett	R. H. Kent	E. Fairbrother
"	7.30 T. A. Jackson	E. Fairbrother	J. McManus	J. E. Roe
Clapham Common	8.30 T. A. Jackson	J. E. Roe	H. Newman	T. A. Jackson
Finbury Park	8.30 A. Anderson	J. Crump	A. Anderson	R. H. Kent
Fulham, op'site Salisbury Hotel	7.30 E. Fairbrother	T. W. Allen	E. Fawcett	H. Newman
Jolly Butchers' Hill	11.30 F. E. Dawkins	J. Crump	F. C. Watts	R. H. Kent
Manor Park Broadway	11.30 T. W. Allen	J. Kent	F. E. Dawkins	W. A. Cole
Paddington, Prince of Wales	11.30 A. Anderson	R. H. Kent	H. C. Phillips	W. Gifford
Plaistow, op'site Abbey Arms	11.30 J. H. Kennett	W. A. Cole	H. Newman	J. Fitzgerald
Tooting Broadway	7.30 J. McManus	H. Newman	T. A. Jackson	F. E. Dawkins
Tottenham, West Green Cnr.	11.30 F. C. Watts	A. Anderson	T. W. Allen	J. Kent
"	7.30 F. E. Dawkins	A. Anderson	A. Anderson	T. W. Allen
Watford Market Place	7.30 F. S. Leigh	F. E. Dawkins	E. Fairbrother	J. Fitzgerald
Woolwich, Beresford Sq.	11.30 J. Kent	T. A. Jackson	J. Fitzgerald	A. Anderson
MONDAYS.	8th.	15th.	22nd.	29th.
Ilford, Roden St.	8.30 J. Kent	W. A. Cole	F. E. Dawkins	J. Kent
WEDNESDAYS.	10th.	17th.	24th.	31st.
Highbury Corner	8.30 F. E. Dawkins	A. Anderson	F. C. Watts	J. Fitzgerald
Walham Green Broadway	8.30 E. Fairbrother	J. E. Roe	E. Fawcett	T. A. Jackson
THURSDAYS.	4th.	11th.	18th.	25th.
North Kensington, corner of Golborne & Bevington Rds.	8.30 F. E. Dawkins	T. W. Allen	F. C. Watts	T. W. Allen
FRIDAYS.	5th.	12th.	19th.	26th.
Battersea, Prince's Head	8.30 T. A. Jackson	E. Fawcett	J. E. Roe	T. A. Jackson
Tooting Broadway	8.30 P. Dumenil	J. McManus	P. Dumenil	J. McManus
SATURDAYS.	6th.	13th.	20th.	27th.
Harringay, outside 'Salisbury'	8.30 A. W. Pearson	A. Anderson	A. W. Pearson	A. Anderson

Printed by A. Jacob, Globe Press, Forest Lane, Stratford, for the Proprietors, The Socialist Party of Great Britain, and published at 22, Great James Street, London.

The
Official Organ
of
The
Socialist Party
of
Great Britain.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

No. 36. Vol. 3.]

LONDON, AUGUST, 1907.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

OUR FIRST LIBEL ACTION.

Plaintiffs' Original Sin.

Nearly twelve months ago, at the instance of the General Secretary and Executive Committee of the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants, a writ for libel was issued against certain individuals, several of whom were not even members of The Socialist Party of Great Britain. Mainly as a result of this mistake of the Plaintiffs or of their legal advisors the hearing of the action has been delayed and the bill of costs greatly lengthened. Several of our comrades have appeared at different times before the Master in Chambers upon Plaintiffs' Solicitors' applications for "Directions" and other "wangles" that go to make up the Game of Law. It has been interesting to watch the wonderment of the lawyers and their office boys at the unusual spectacle of half-a-dozen members of the Socialist working class up against the legal luminaries engaged, at a heavy fee, to "clear the character" of Mr. R. Bell, M.P., and his fellow officials of the A.S.R.S. And the legal luminaries have not always scored.

The Trial.

Originally, many were sued, but ultimately, two were chosen. These, Comrades A. Anderson and J. Fitzgerald duly appeared before Mr. Justice Darling on July 15th. Arrayed against them were an eminent K.C., Mr. C. F. Gill, and two other Barristers-at-Law, Messrs. Edmond Browne and E. A. Hume, all instructed by Messrs. Pattinson & Brewer, Plaintiffs' Solicitors. Several files of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, from No. 1 to date, as well as single copies of last August issue, were referred to, quoted from, and passed up to the Judge and the Jury. The Second Edition of our Manifesto was also in evidence. Mr. Gill did his best to "confuse the issue" by withholding, until "m' Lud" drew attention to it, the fact that the E.C. of the A.S.R.S. deliberately ignored the vote of the members concerned and took action in direct opposition to the voting. He also endeavoured to prejudice the Jury by suggesting that the defendants desired to deprive respectable citizens (like himself) of what they had worked hard for and hoped to enjoy in their old age and misrepresented the position of this Party concerning Trade Unions by quoting a resolution which was moved at a Party meeting and ultimately rejected. He also, assisted by Mr. Bell, impressed the Court that those who voted against accepting the concessions voted in favour of a strike, which was not true. He quoted extracts from back numbers of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD which had nothing to do with the case until pulled up by the Judge, who "hoped they would get to the libel shortly." He put Mr. R. Bell, M.P., J.P., into the box and after asking him a few questions, left him to the tender mercies of our comrades. If Mr. Bell's attitude in the witness box, under the raking fire of Anderson and Fitzgerald, was typical of his general demeanour, it is impossible for him to give a straight answer. He is a shuffler, first, last, and always.

Mr. Bell, M.P., Labour Misdemeanour.

Not only is Mr. Bell a shuffler, but judging

by his answer to one of Fitzgerald's questions, he is cynically indifferent to the conditions under which many of the members of the A.S.R.S. work. He and his Counsel made much of the fact that only 3,000 out of 10,000 N.E.R. men voted, but when asked whether large numbers were at work and therefore unable to attend the meetings he replied "I am not responsible for that." And his reply to a further question as to whether, when his Executive issued the call for a vote, they intended to abide by the result, should also be carefully noted by railway workers. He practically admitted that there was no intention of carrying out the expressed wishes of the N.E.R. men, unless they coincided with the previously formed views of the Executive. Thus the funds of the Union were wasted and the men fooled. Mr. Bell, in the witness-box, referred to himself as a Trade Union "Leader." We have no hesitation in describing him as a Misdemeanour of the working class.

The Verdict and After.

Following upon their searching questions, the speeches of our comrades Anderson and Fitzgerald must have come as a surprise to the Court. Of the working class, eating their bread by the sweat of their faces, when permitted by the master class to do so, lacking all the advantages possessed by the bewigged and begowned masters of the forensic art, our comrades logically and eloquently submitted our case to the Jury. But, of course, the verdict went against us. We were prepared for that. Mr. R. Bell and his fellow plaintiffs were awarded damages to the amount of forty shillings! For ourselves, we shall continue our comments on political and industrial events without fear or favour. We shall say what we think at all times, in whatever language we consider the circumstances justify. This is our first libel action but it may not be our last. We will take that risk and others that may arise. The Socialist Party of Great Britain came into existence to fearlessly advocate the Cause of the Working Class and that Cause will be advocated, by voice and pen, until finally our fellow-workers shall see the light and, discarding their misleaders, capitalist and "labour," will unite in a conscious effort to emancipate themselves by assuming control of the means of wealth production and distribution.

REPORT OF THE TRIAL.

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

KING'S BENCH DIVISION.

(Before Mr. Justice Darling and a Special Jury.)

This was an action for an alleged libel which appeared in THE SOCIALIST STANDARD. The plaintiffs were Mr. Richard Bell, M.P., the general secretary of the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants, a society registered under the Trade Union Acts of 1871 and 1876, and the other members of the executive committee of the society. The defendants were Messrs. A. Anderson and J. Fitzgerald, sued on behalf of themselves and the other members of The Socialist

Party of Great Britain. The matter complained of consisted of the words "Found Out" in large leaded capitals, and immediately below in lighter capitals, "Labour Leaders Sell the Union Members," followed by an account of a mass meeting of servants of the North-Eastern Railway, held at Newcastle on July 15th, 1906, for the purpose of considering a report by the plaintiff Mr. Bell as to certain negotiations carried on by the executive committee on behalf of the society with the North-Eastern Railway. The defendants denied malice, and denied that the statements complained of were false, and they pleaded fair comment.

Mr. Gill, K.C., Mr. Edmond Browne, and Mr. E. A. Hume appeared for the plaintiffs; the defendants Anderson and Fitzgerald appeared in person.

Mr. GILL said that the above society was a very powerful trade union, with a large number of members and branches, its object being to improve the condition of the members and the relations of employers and employed and to promote the safety of railway travelling. From time to time there was what was known as an "all grades" movement in connexion with the North-Eastern Railway, and the general secretary's report presented to the meeting at Cardiff in October, 1906, stated that the movement was sanctioned by the executive committee in 1903. The matter having been threshed out, a conclusion was recommended for acceptance by the men, and that was agreed to in May, 1906, at a conference of the men and the representatives of the railway. An expression of opinion was sought from the men, but so few troubled to vote that when the matter came before the executive committee, which represented the whole society and not merely the servants of one railway, they, on July 12th, 1906, found that only 3,000 out of 10,000 had voted on the question, there being a majority of about 800 in favour of rejecting the terms. Later the executive committee resolved that as so few voted they instructed their secretary to write to the North-Eastern Railway accepting the concessions. All the committee but two voted in favour of that, but Mr. Bell, the secretary, did not vote at all. The rules of the society provided that there was power in the executive committee to take any decisive action subject to a right of appeal to the general meeting, and the committee had power to decide whether they would order a strike at the expense of the whole society. In this case the committee thought it desirable to accept the concessions, although a majority of the members who were servants of that railway were unwilling to do so. Some of the servants of the North-Eastern Railway afterwards expressed adverse opinions as to the benefits which had been derived from the negotiations. The matter attracted the attention of the defendants, known as The Socialist Party of Great Britain, which published a paper called THE SOCIALIST STANDARD.

Mr. GILL said he did not propose to rove over the whole of the paper, interesting as he found it yesterday afternoon.

The Judge.—It is not a Sunday paper.

Mr. GILL.—I think it is peculiarly adapted for Sunday consumption, and walking in the park one sometimes hears a little of it.

Mr. GILL said that in the August, 1906 number the matter complained of appeared—namely, "Found out. Labour Leaders sell the union members and their apologist gets a warm reception." If this was confined to the Socialist party and was only read in their family circles no one would complain, but they gratuitously distributed copies of the paper to the branches of the society. The action was not brought to recover money, as one did not expect to get money from people who held these views. One of the chief reasons why people worked was to save a little money and have it for themselves. The action was, however, brought to prevent the mischief caused by such statements as the libel in question.

Mr. Richard Bell, M.P. for Derby, one of the plaintiffs, stated that he had been general secretary of the society for ten years. It had 90,000 members and 650 branches. An enormous amount of labour was devoted to the negotiations with the North-Eastern Railway, and certain conclusions were agreed to by the representatives of the company and the men. In July, 1906, the executive committee determined that the terms should be accepted and the negotiations should be continued with a view to a conciliation board being appointed. The matter was referred to in witness's report to the general meeting, and at a meeting of the servants of the North-Eastern Railway some disapproval was expressed. There was no foundation for the imputations made upon him in the alleged libel. The executive committee had considered the interests of the society as a whole. They represented the whole of the members, and not a section.

Cross-examined by Mr. ANDERSON.—The result of the negotiations was submitted to a conference of delegates held at Darlington, and they decided to adjourn the conference to take the opinion of the members of their branches. That adjournment was irregular, and the executive committee decided that they could take the opinion of the branches without the expense of an adjourned conference. There was a majority of 802 against accepting the terms. In spite of this adverse majority, the executive committee accepted the terms. Witness did not think that was dishonourable. He got rather an unfavourable reception, but that was nothing new.

By Mr. FITZGERALD.—The executive committee had to take into consideration the interests of the whole society and not of a section.

Why did you ask for a vote if you were not going to act upon it?—Just to get their opinion; there were 10,000 men altogether, and only 3,000 voted.

Did you not know that owing to Sunday duty many could not get away?—I am not responsible for that.

Mr. FITZGERALD.—The men are not either. Did you ask for instructions and then ignore them?—No, we asked for an opinion, and two-thirds declined to express an opinion.

Continuing, witness said that the executive committee had power and were justified in declining to authorise a strike on the vote of 800 men. So far as work was concerned, he believed that nearly the whole of the men interested could have attended.

Mr. ANDERSON.—When you issued the call to the members of the society, did you, as the paid servant of the men, intend to act on the result of the vote?—We intended to act as the circumstances justified.

Is it your opinion that the members who did vote voted with the idea that their vote would be acted on if they had a two-thirds majority?—I cannot say what each individual had in his mind.

Mr. FITZGERALD.—Is it a fact that since the Newcastle meeting you have been appointed a justice of the peace?

Mr. JUSTICE DARLING created roars of laughter when he remarked that Mr. Fitzgerald was entitled to ask anything to Mr. Bell's discredit, but "I cannot say sitting here that even if that is so the world ought to think any the worse of him."

Mr. FITZGERALD was prompt with his retort: I did not want to discredit him: I wanted to show that not a great deal of damage had been inflicted.

Mr. BELL.—I don't know that the Newcastle

meeting had anything to do with the J. P.

Mr. ANDERSON, addressing the jury, declared that the headings were justified. The men were asked to vote on a question, and were then tricked, imposed on, and sold.

At Newcastle, where Mr. Bell went to explain and apologise for the action of the union, he got a very hostile reception. Mr. Anderson said he was a member of the working class and a Socialist. Mr. Gill had attacked his position as a Socialist, which had nothing to do with the case, and it would have been just as relevant if he had referred to Mr. Bell's attack on Labour leaders, such as Mr. Philip Snowden and Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, who neglected their Parliamentary duties to write articles for capitalist newspapers and the Harmsworth brigade.

Mr. FITZGERALD also briefly addressed the jury. Mr. JUSTICE DARLING, in summing up, said that under the rules the executive committee were not bound to obey the majority of the members who were employed by the North-Eastern Railway and who voted on the question, but they had to consider the interests of the society as a whole. If the plaintiffs had not betrayed their trust they were entitled to a verdict.

The jury found a verdict for the plaintiffs for 40s.

TRADE UNIONISM.

S.L.P. versus S.P.G.B.

To prove our proposition in this debate we shall first state the true Socialist position on the trade union question and then proceed to show how the wanderings of the S.P.G.B. away from that position have landed them into great confusion.

In this paper the word "political" will cover all action affecting the state, including the political ballot, the political strike and the political rising. "Economic" will be held to mean "on the field of industry." The basis of all Socialist tactics is the class struggle, which arises economically and is developed into politics.

Every member of the working class is employed by a member or members of the capitalist class. The antagonism of class interests in the workshop, mine, or factory, arising from the ownership by the capitalist class of the means of production, is expressed by the formula "more wages, less profits; less wages, more profits," and is the basic, the original and the most obvious expression of the class struggle. When this is thoroughly grasped by any worker, he will readily proceed further to understand that just as he and his shopmates have a common interest against their employer, so he and his class have a common interest against the employing class as a whole, organised in the state. Therefore from the point of view of making Socialists, revolutionary propaganda in the workshops is by far the most potent means.

The class antagonism in the workshop forces itself more or less clearly on the notice of all the workers and drives them to unite in unions the better to carry on their side of the contest.

Trade unions in this country had their origin in an age when the handicraft industry was only beginning to be supplanted by machine industry, and they therefore took the form of unions of craftsmen. As the development of machinery is rapidly making the craftsman as extinct as the dodo, these craft unions have gradually lost all the usefulness they ever had, to the working class at least; and now by artificially dividing the workers along the lines of supposed craft interests, they obscure their common class interest and so are stumbling blocks in the way of working-class emancipation. These craft unions are constantly quarrelling and blacklegging on each other; they foster and encourage that mischievous division of the workers into mechanics and labourers, which is such an obstacle to working-class solidarity. Again they have become a great vested interest and have brought into existence a powerful group of permanent officials whose chief interest in life is to keep their jobs intact and who dominate the great mass of the workers on both the industrial and political fields. By trucking to the craft unions and their officials more than one revolutionary movement in this country which started out full of promise, has been finally engulfed in a bog of opportunism and compromise.

Economic organisation then, being necessary and inevitable, must to fulfil its proper functions, be based on *class* not on *craft* lines, and must have as its object the real interest of the working class, namely, the overthrow of the parasite capitalist class and the taking over and holding the means of production by and for the workers themselves. In other words, the economic organisation of the workers must be a revolutionary class union. To be a class union it must unite all wage workers according to industries, in other words according to their actual economic groupings. Thus all the workers in a particular workshop or factory would form one local union which would form part of the Union of the particular industry in question and this again would be a department of the general union which would unite in itself all the industrial organisations. Such an union the A. of I.U. are endeavouring to start in Great Britain, and we claim that, without it, the overthrow of capitalism will be impossible. History teaches very clearly that economic power invariably precedes political. It was only after they had gained complete control of the means of production, that the capitalists attained political power, and so must the working class. The bourgeoisie gained control over the means of production through the possession of property, but the working class who have no property, can only do so through organisation. It is they that carry on every operation of production, and, if organised industrially, they can control every productive process.

The power of the organised workers to carry on or stop production at will is the power that will overthrow capitalism, and usher in the Socialist Republic. Whatever of good there is in electoral action, it is obvious that the master class will never surrender their privileged position to votes alone, unless behind those votes stands the organised might of the workers, ready and able to enforce the mandate of their ballot.

The industrial union is then necessary to the workers under capitalism, and is necessary for the overthrowing of capitalism, and its existence must precede effective political action of any kind. It is therefore the clear duty of every revolutionary Socialist to join us in forming such an union.

And now what is the position of the S.P.G.B.? Their Manifesto, issued in 1905, states that trade unions should be supported if they act on sound lines, and opposed if they act wrongly—a neutral position, which, when applied to politics, the S.P.G.B. repudiates. Nothing is said in this Manifesto about the necessity of revolutionary economic organisation for overthrowing capitalism. No clear and definite tactics are outlined for the guidance of a party which above all else prides itself on the clearness and definiteness of its position, as witness the phrase—now well-worn even to slabbiness—*anent* "clear and unmistakable principles interpreted in plain and unequivocal tactics." On the other hand a facing-both-ways attitude was adopted which leaves every situation, as it arises, open to doubt, discussion and hesitation.

At the first Conference of the S.P.G.B. a motion in favour of a straight and uncompromising position was rejected, and a vague and indefinite resolution adopted instead.

In as much as all articles in THE SOCIALIST STANDARD were first approved by the executive committee, who made a practice of rejecting matter they considered unsound, the appearance of Allen's article on "Boring from Within" in THE SOCIALIST STANDARD for November, 1905, was hailed by well-wishers of the Party as a sign that they had at last come down from the fence on the union question and had adopted a straight, uncompromising attitude. In this article, we find the following:

We Socialists want to see industrial unionism, that is, we want to see *all* the workers in each trade organised, and the various trades in each industry affiliated, thus forming one huge, cohesive organisation of the workers.

But, however bright the hopes raised by the publication of "Boring from Within," they were doomed to be dashed to the ground. A further article by Allen on the same lines was in March, 1906, rejected as unsound, and at the annual conference of that year, a motion in favour of revolutionary industrial unionism was defeated and the question referred to a Party meeting.

This was held in four instalments in May—

June, 1906. Several resolutions were put on the agenda, including one by the then Bexley branch, which gave expression to the position outlined at the beginning of this paper. All were, however, defeated but two—Kent's and Fitzgerald's. Space is too short to recite these in full, but their mutual contradictions may be summarized as follows:

Kent's resolution

- declares war on existing unions,
- advocates the formation of a Socialist industrial union. (Though insisting that such union must be controlled by the S.P.G.B.),
- adopts as method, therefore, what is known as "boring from without,"

Fitzgerald's resolution

- does not declare war against existing unions,
- advocates the formation of a Socialist craft union—"the trade sub-division as the chief detail of organisation,"
- adopts as method "boring from within."

It had been decided by the 1906 Conference that a poll should be taken on any resolutions passed by the Party meeting. This was not done till the beginning of the present year—the S.P.G.B. being left for 6 or 7 months in the extraordinary position of having provisionally adopted at one and the same time two mutually destructive positions.

When at last the poll was taken the party rejected both the resolutions. For this we commend them. But to destroy what is unsound is not enough; construction is needed. The rescinding of Kent's and Fitzgerald's resolutions simply brought the S.P.G.B. back to the nebulousness of the 1905 Manifesto, and there, so far as we can ascertain, they still remain.

The S.P.G.B. in holding a Party meeting last year to define their attitude on the union question, were admitting that up to that time, despite the Manifesto, their attitude on the union question had not been satisfactorily defined. After the best wisdom of the Party had been expended during the four sessions of this meeting in adopting, not one but two positions, the membership has by its action declared both of these to be also unsatisfactory. But instead of at once endeavouring to define a sound policy, they have been satisfied to return to an attitude, which by their action they have already declared to be unsound.

We therefore maintain that on the question of trade unionism, the position of the S.P.G.B. is one of hopeless confusion.

LONDON ADVOCATES OF INDUSTRIAL UNIONISM.

REPLY TO ADVOCATES OF INDUSTRIAL UNIONISM.

To talk of the S.P.G.B. "wandering away" from the true position practically asserts that the S.P.G.B. at one time held the true position—otherwise they could not have wandered away from it—a thing the "Advocates" deny later on.

After a reference to the position of employer and employed, we are told by our critics that "revolutionary propaganda in the workshops is by far the most potent means" though they are curiously silent as to *how* this is to be done today under the strict supervision that exists in most modern factories and where any attempt to propagate Socialist ideas, or push literature, is usually followed by dismissal.

Paragraph 6 says—

Economic organisation . . . must be based on *class* not on *craft* lines and then goes on to say—

To be a class union it must unite all the wage-workers according to industries (!)

Perhaps this is a specimen of New Scots humor but the contradiction in talking of forming a "class" union according to "industry" should have been obvious even to the "Advocates." It is then said—

Thus all the workers in a particular workshop or factory would form one local union, which would form part of the union of the particular industry in question and this again would be a department of the general union which would unite in itself all the industrial organisations. Such an union the A. of I.U. are endeavouring to form in Great Britain.

From the above jumble of local unions, departments, industrial organisations, etc., forming finally a general union one can only draw the conclusion that the time thus occupied will be wasted since the General Federation of Trade

Unions is in the field to carry on that work.

In paragraph 7 we are told that—
The power of the organised workers to carry on or stop production at will is the power that will overthrow capitalism and usher in the Socialist Republic.

This is begging the entire question for it is exactly the question of *what* power that is in dispute. The Anarchist claims that the strike, particularly the "general" strike, is the method to be followed—an attitude to-day rechristened "direct action." If the "Advocates" mean the power of the economic organisations on the industrial field they are preaching the same stupid fallacy. The power of the workers to carry on or stop production depends entirely upon their control of the fighting forces, and even if all men were inside their industrial unions they could no more "take and hold" the means of production and distribution by that form of organisation than by the present ones. With the modern weapons of precision and rapid death-dealing, the unarmed and undrilled workers would be easily driven out of the mills and factories, while, with the large stores at their command, the capitalist class could sit down and let starvation complete the work.

Just previously the "Advocates" stated that "the bourgeoisie gained control over the means of production through the possession of property (as though means of production were not property) while as a matter of historical fact the bourgeoisie laid the foundations of their control by first building up an army under Cromwell and Fairfax to fight the Army of the Feudal Aristocracy."

After what we have stated paragraph 8 is quite gratuitous as not one of the so-called "necessary" things have been shown to be even useful, let alone necessary.

The criticism of the S.P.G.B. position then begins. We are told that this position is "neutral." This must be another joke, for how a position that opposes one side and supports another can be "neutral" will puzzle the "Advocates" to explain. They state—

Nothing is said in this Manifesto about the necessity of revolutionary economic organisation for overthrowing capitalism.

But the Manifesto on p. 10 says:—

The basis of the actions of the trade unions must be a clear recognition of the position of the workers under capitalism and the class struggle necessarily resulting therefrom: in other words they must adopt the Socialist position if they are going to justify their existence at all.

Can the "Advocates" put the position better? Yet they call this a "facing both-ways attitude."

The quotation from THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, in paragraph 11, is carefully selected, for the whole of the article with the exception of that sentence is devoted to advocating a Socialist union, and when Allen openly advocated industrial unions in his next article it was rejected.

At the Annual Conference, when the industrial union resolution was moved, it was the "Advocates" who opposed having an open discussion on the matter and wanted it rushed through there and then. Space is too short to give the resolutions in full they say. This must have been fortunate for the "Advocates" as it enables them to make false statements under the cover of want of space.

The resolutions are given in full in the July, 1906 and February, 1907 SOCIALIST STANDARDS, where it will be seen that Kent's resolution did not state that the union must be controlled by the S.P.G.B., while Fitzgerald's advocates a Socialist union on a class basis—the rest being matters of detail—and urges propaganda outside as well as inside the trade unions and cannot be called "boring from within" in any sense of that much abused phrase.

The "Advocates," in commending us for rejecting these resolutions, seem unaware that the reasons given for this rejection were that the position laid down in the Manifesto, coupled with the Declaration of Principles, was a sufficiently clear exposition of the Socialist position on Trade Unionism.

The next paragraph says:—

The S.P.G.B. in holding a Party Meeting last year to define their attitude on the trade union question, were admitting that up to that time, despite the Manifesto, their attitude on the union question had not been satisfactorily defined.

This is a piece of cheap, specious pleading that will deceive few. At every one of our propaganda meetings we invite discussion of the

Principles of Socialism. Does this admit that those Principles are not satisfactory? Certainly not. When a few members had been bitten with the I.W.W. fever and tried to get their views adopted without adequate discussion, then the meetings were called to openly discuss the position and see if these supporters of the I.W.W. could show any flaw in our standpoint. This they entirely failed to do and the vote of the Party resulted as above. In face of these simple facts the rest of the paragraph is sheer nonsense and on the whole question they have completely failed to show that any confusion or unsoundness exists on the side of the S.P.G.B.

But what is the position of the "Advocates"? Why are they so peculiarly silent on the question of existing industrial unions? It may be said that none exist as yet in Great Britain. If for the sake of argument we assume this, then whence does Industrial Unionism arise? The answer is America. When the Industrial Workers of the World Union was formed in Chicago in 1905 certain persons in this country adopted the idea without examination or discussion and tried to form a branch of that organisation here through the Advocates of Industrial Unionism.

At the beginning the I.W.W. was endorsed in full, its literature distributed, and phrases and terms used in America imported here. And one of the chief arguments used by the I.W.W. supporters in America was that the present unions manufactured their own blacklegs by their high initiation fees, dues, etc. which must be paid or the member is excluded.

Any union that excludes members for non-payment of dues—which non-payment is largely due to unemployment—manufactures its own blacklegs, and this is exactly what the I.W.W. does. Its entrance fee and minimum dues are larger than several English unions, while its period for arrears of dues ordering exclusion, is 60 days as against the 180 days allowed by the majority of existing unions.

The I.W.W. therefore tends to make its own blacklegs faster even than the ordinary unions mentioned and accentuates the very evil complained of. This point by itself is sufficient to condemn the I.W.W., but it is not all. The organisers and officials of the I.W.W. tell the workers that their "pure and simple" strikes are failures because conducted on "craft" lines but that an I.W.W. strike would be victorious because their position is invincible. Yet every strike they have undertaken has been a failure! The Buffalo Garment Workers, the Wichita Bakers and the Schenectady Electrical Workers' strikes—all organised and run by the I.W.W.—were complete victories for the employers. A split has lately taken place and we have the encouraging spectacle of the workers being indivisibly and economically united into *two* I.W.W.'s. Inability to decide which Workers of the World they should endorse is perhaps responsible for the attempt to form a third—British—Workers of the World here, and curiously enough by the very means so readily condemned in others. Not only are they ready and willing to attend any craft or other union for the purpose of advocating their views, but as in the case of members of the S.L.P., they appear upon the platforms and support men and organisations, (under the cover of it being a meeting for Industrial Unionism) that at other times they condemn as misleaders of the working class. Such actions would not be tolerated for a moment by the S.P.G.B. On this point our position has been clear and consistent. No deliberate support of capitalists or capitalism has been allowed, and in one or two cases where such occurred the members offending were at once put outside. No excuse—trade union or other—has been allowed to cover any voluntary action in support of capitalism, but adherence to the Declaration of Principles insisted on in every case.

The fact that Industrial Unionism is the latest of many attempts that have been made to form a Socialist organisation with non-Socialist material is not only bound to produce failure, but, as is shown in America, also adds another organisation to the long list of those that provide a field for, and give encouragement to, the "Labour Fakir" and misleader. The position of the S.P.G.B., on the contrary, is to carry on Socialist education towards the building up of the Socialist economic organisation that will aid the Socialist Party to abolish capitalism.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, subscriptions for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, articles, correspondence and advertisements submitted for insertion therein should be addressed, —The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 22, Great James Street, London, W.C., to whom Money Orders should be made payable. THE SOCIALIST STANDARD is published on the first day in each month.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office every Tuesday at 7 p.m.

Terms of Subscriptions.

UNITED KINGDOM.		
Twelve Months	...	1s. 6d.
Six Months	...	9d.
AMERICA.		
Twelve Months	...	50 cents.
Six Months	...	25 cents.

Scale of Charges for Advertisements.

	6 s. d.
Per Inch, One Insertion	...
Quarter Column do.	...
Half Column do.	...
One Column do.	...

Special arrangements will be made for Advertisements to be inserted in more than one issue.

The Socialist Standard,



THURSDAY, AUG. 1, 1907.

Our Policy then and now.

In the first number of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, published in September, 1904, it was stated in an editorial that "in dealing with all questions affecting the welfare of the working class our standpoint will be frankly revolutionary. We shall show that the misery, the poverty and degradation caused by capitalism grow far more rapidly than does the enacting of palliative legislation for its removal. The adequate alleviation of these ills can be brought about only by a political party having Socialism for its object. So long as the powers of administration are controlled by the capitalist class so long can that class render nugatory any legislation they consider to unduly favour the workers."

No critic can deny that this line of policy has been consistently followed throughout the three volumes of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD which are completed with this issue. It was our policy then and it is our policy now, and will remain our policy till the workers come by their own.

Their Policy now and Then.

As the official organ of the Party, THE SOCIALIST STANDARD has, therefore, consistently voiced the interests of the working class during the time when it is more than ever necessary to do so since in general those interests are yet denied or unrecognised by the very class they mostly concern. It must, however, frankly be admitted that there are quite a number of working-class "leaders" who are prepared to tell the workers the truth about their position—when it pays, but the trouble is that it does not always or even usually pay in the ordinary sense; which may explain the gyrations and inconsistencies of so-called Socialists who, for example, will say at one time that the capitalist class cannot and will not abolish unemployment, yet who will at another time take the lead in an appeal to the capitalist class to put an end to unemployment, the corner-stone of the very system upon which it lives.

The attitude of BY-ENDS toward CHRISTIAN bears considerable resemblance to the attitude of many of these "leaders" toward the consistent Socialist.

"Why, they," said BY-ENDS, "after their headstrong manner, conclude that it is duty to rush on their journey all weathers; and I am for waiting for wind and tide. They are for hazarding all for God at a clap; and I am for taking all advantages to secure my life and estate. They are for holding their notions, though all other men are against them; but I am for religion in what, and so far as the times, and my safety will bear it. They are for religion

when in rags and contempt; but I am for him when he walks in his golden slippers, in the sunshine, and with applause."

The race of BY-ENDS is unfortunately far from being extinct.

"The Menace of Socialism."

The *Daily Express* endeavours to make capital—or rather profit—out of the prominence which the word "Socialism" has attained during the past few years. The character of its attack upon what for its purpose it chooses to consider as Socialism, is quite worthy of the traditions of "yellow" or capitalist journalism.

In heavy type on its leader page the *Express* published the following:—

Why not look the facts in the face? The issue is no longer Liberalism against Conservatism. It is, instead, Constitutionalism—which signifies unity of Empire and the rights of property, law and order—against Socialism, which stands for disruption, for loot, for the elimination of individual enterprise, and the incentive to do great things for laziness, for ATHEISM and FREE LOVE.

Here wage-slavery, the exploitation of the mass of the people to supply the luxuries and ease of wealthy drones appears disguised as Constitutionalism, Empire, Property, Law and Order! Whilst Socialism is disguised also but in a different way as Disruption, Loot, Laziness, Atheism and Free Love!

But who, pray, is it intended should be frightened by these scarecrows? Is it the worker? Or is the leech to be applied to some scared capitalists for the benefit of the free and glorious Press?

The answer to the wild ravings of the *Express* is soberly unfolded month by month in the columns of this journal; and any reader who follows the instalments of Kautsky's work will be enabled to understand and appreciate the depravity of such apologies for capitalism.

Bogey!

The tirade of the *Daily Express* against Socialism is palpably overdone. In the eyes of the average worker the *Express* simply makes itself ridiculous by its antics. If the result at Jarrow showed that the working class can no longer be relied upon to vote Liberal or Conservative, the result at Colne Valley showed that at least the word "Socialism" is no longer a bogey from which the workers will fly in terror.

But is the *Express* concerned with this? Is not its aim rather to scare the less astute section of the capitalists into helping forward an Anti-Socialist League scheme and into providing, incidentally, of course, some very profitable jobs?

If we have to realise that the capitalist Press is a powerful aid to the supremacy of the ruling class, we are also sure that the parasitic nature of that Press makes it at times a sad thorn in the side of our enemy, and a heavy drain on its ill-gotten "swag."

The Great Sham Fight.

The *Daily Express* knows, as do the smarter among the capitalists, that the Liberal Party so far from giving way to the so-called Socialists, stoops but to conquer. By patronage, by flattery, by subsidisation, if need be, the Liberal Party collects under its wing the "labour" men who, not having been elected to wage the class struggle for Socialism, and not being answerable to a class-conscious electorate, but being merely the expressions of personal ambition, and of confusion and vague aspiration among the electors, become easily dupes or tools in the hands of the enemies of the working class. Thus the teeth of the labour leaders are drawn, jobs are found for them and they become "respectable, adaptable and sensible" citizens; tranquilizers of the discontented among the workers and bulwarks against revolutionary working-class action.

The Liberals, like the mountain that was in labour, are big in promise—it is part of the game, although the fulfilment could only be as chaff to the workers; but even as it is the net result behind all their hypocrisy out-tries the Tories.

The retention of the party division, splitting as it does the capitalist party into two factions, is a splendid dodge for blinding the worker to the truth. But Liberal and Tory, like the genial sun and the boisterous wind in the old fable have identical objects—only their methods differ.

HERE AND THERE.

STUDENTS of Bible-lore can hardly have failed to observe that the steady deterioration in Saul's character dated from the time that unfortunate monarch was observed by the gossips to be "among the prophets."

The Editor of the *Review of Reviews* should have noted the fact before assuming the role of prophet. Says he: "The men and women of Leyden listened for an hour and a half with rapt attention while I proclaimed the great truth that the coming of the Federation of the World is near at hand."

It appears that Lord Milner unkindly postponed "the garnering of the harvest of the Peace Conference of 1899 by his determination to crush the Boers." These little eventualities are most trying to the modern seer. Then, again, the Organiser of Peace—and incidentally collector of pieces—has omitted from his calculations the somewhat strained relations subsisting between Master and Man all over the world.

Which reminds one of the bright and beautiful boy who—magnificently heedless of details—ignored the "blooming dots" in a problem involving "decimals," and so arrived at an alarmingly incorrect, not to say, wildly impossible, solution.

But our enterprising journalist has, at any rate, learned the supreme merit of vagueness in his valuations. "Near at hand" cannot be accused of Baxterian definiteness. But Upton Sinclair, of Chicago, where the potted meat et cetera—no negligible quantity either, that "cetera"—comes from, is distressingly definite when he assumes the prophet's mantle. As thus: "The Social Revolution will take place in America within one year after the Presidential Election of 1912."

And who is to be the "Abraham Lincoln of the coming revolution"? HEARST!

No comment. Perhaps our American comrades will oblige.

Really, if one is to judge from the enthusiastic reports which London teachers have brought back as a result of their visit to American schools, the New country must be a veritable El Dorado for the Knights and Dames of the Ferule. (One reads of schools where "the entrance hall was decorated with large palms and other shrubs, giving it more the appearance of a conservatory leading into a gentleman's mansion than the entrance to a schoolroom," of "lavish expenditure" on equipment, of "delightful atmosphere" in schools. One enthusiastic lady is even led to remark, somewhat obscurely, that "only he who sees takes off his shoes.")

In spite of all these advantages, in New York, 90 per cent. of the teachers are women, because "men of education usually draft off into pursuits where dollars flow more freely." Note right here, that "salaries are much higher here than in any other city of the States." No wonder the pedagogues of Washington "complain bitterly."

Of course, the usual snobbery, the internecine feuds among workers which are inseparable from the capitalist system, is to be observed. "I had plenty of opportunities of noting that in the States, as in England, the University graduate and the normal school graduate do not dwell together in unity; they are inclined to nurse a mutual prejudice; they rarely dream of going to school with each other."

The average teacher has need "to go to school" again to learn certain facts. For instance: the "emancipation of the Certificated Class Teacher" can only be accomplished in the general emancipation of the class to which he belongs—the worker. While he may be able to snatch an apparent "victory" here, a doubtful "concession" there, (for which he is always "truly thankful. Amen."), the economic trend of events must tend to make his wages conform to the general law operating in the present

state of Society—they must tend to bare subsistence level. He has only his labour-power to sell in the mart. This he cannot dissociate from himself. He goes along with it. He is a commodity.

The Socialist Party of Great Britain is open for membership to all workers. Its aim is the emancipation of the worker, its strength the recognition of the futility of "reform," its inspiration the knowledge that it is but a factor aiding in and accelerating the inevitable Revolution towards which Society is progressing.

A. REGINALD.

A LOOK ROUND.

John E. Williams has been elected a member of the West Ham Board of Guardians. Whilst avoiding in his election address many of the pitfalls usually associated with S.D.F. candidates, he could not refrain from promising that which he knew he could not perform. "I say frankly," he declared, "that if elected I go to the Board to force my former colleague in the Dock, the Rt. Hon. John Burns, M.P., to do his duty to the countless poor of Canning Town." Fiddlesticks! J. B.'s "duty" is to the folks who gave him his present job.

On the day following his election, Williams was congratulated at Tower Hill, and informed his hearers that one of his first steps would be to call a conference of all the Poor Law authorities with the object of pressing the Government to nationalise the Poor Rate. But if the working class do not pay the rates, and if, to quote Mr. W. Thorne, M.P., it would make no difference to the working class if the rates went up to 20/- in the £, what concern is it to men who "have nothing to lose but their chains" whether the Poor Law is nationalised or not?

There is one thing the advocates of this "reform" never mention—the question of control. If the central government will consent to the abolition of local rates, to the raising of all charges for the Poor Law, Education, etc., out of national funds, is it to be expected that they will permit such funds to be administered locally? Not a bit of it. And so with the nationalisation of the Poor Rate must come the withdrawal of all local spending powers and the extension of the L.G.B. to deal with the funds. Is this what Mr. Williams is aiming at?

Even if the Liberals have discharged men from Woolwich, say Liberal papers, the Tories were as bad and worse. What are the facts? Between June 1st, 1902, and November 30th, 1905, 4,567 men were discharged, an average of about 108 per month. Between December 1st, 1906, and June 22nd, 1907, the discharges numbered 2,473, equal to about 370 per month! There is no doubt that Codlin's friend, not Short.

In a statement issued by the committee "formed to protect the holders of Debentures secured upon Breweries and licensed properties," Sir John Ellerman, chairman of a large London Brewery Co. is reported to have said: "Capital is a shy bird and, if unduly oppressed, it has a knack of seeking employment in other countries where the capitalist is more fairly treated, to the benefit of the country where it is employed." Now, why can't the people whose security is threatened by the introduction of a time limit present their case without twaddle of this sort?

Imagine a Brewery Company, for example, shifting its Brewery and plant to, say, Germany, where the people are quite satisfied with the German brew. Of course the thing is impossible. Before they could withdraw their capital they would have to sell out and they could only sell out, at ruinous prices, to others, on whose behalf the business would be continued as before.

Mr. Lever, says "P.W.W." in the Parliamentary column of the *Daily News*, "makes no pre-

tence that the building of Port Sunlight was an act of benevolence or philanthropy. 'A successful business,' he explains, 'must have physically efficient workpeople.' Quite so, Mr. Lever is a cute capitalist.

A Blue Book has been issued giving the report of the Textile Factories (India) Labour Committee appointed in December, 1906. The Committee recommend that the hours of labour should be reduced to 72 per week!

The Liberal Press in particular is still booming our growing trade and alleged unprecedented prosperity; due to Free Trade. It is, therefore, somewhat unkind for Sir James Crichton Browne to declare that "except as an occasional luxury, meat is beyond the reach of the working class of this country and it is therefore necessary that they should be taught what is the best substitute for it." He declared himself, at the Mansion House on June 26th, a firm believer in the value of the mutton chop, and would like to see a sirloin on the Sunday dinner table of every family in the land.

After this it is easy to understand why a movement to improve the health of the people by abolishing luxuries from the table is to be started in Bethnal Green. The Simple Life is somewhat of a chestnut there.

And now a par. from *London Opinion* will not be amiss:—

I see it stated that the keepers of City restaurants find their meat bills decreasing owing to the lighter luncheons which are being taken by the clerks and other office workers. The fashion for commercial men to take only the lightest of meals is alleged to be increasing. I do not believe a word of it. Whenever an Englishman has money in his pocket he is prepared to eat meat, and if City workers abandon it, that is simply because of the want of money. How some of the toilers manage to buy a lunch at all is a mystery to me.

Sir Jas. Crichton Browne also said that he would like to see all proved adulterators of food electrocuted. One of these days the working class may remember his words. But if a Socialist were to advise that those who are battenning and fattening upon the misery of the poor should be shot, or hanged, or electrocuted, he would be charged with inciting to murder and sedition.

As a property-owner, writes Mr. George Cadbury in the *Daily News* for July 16th, I have no fear whatever of the success of Labour men... I believe that so far as this country is concerned the stability of the Throne and of the institutions of our country will be secured, not by resistance to ameliorative measures, but by doing justice to those who produce its wealth.

In these sentiments Mr. Cadbury, who is a member of the I.L.P., expresses the feelings of many of the members of that body. The "institutions of our country" are the State, the Church, the Law, etc. These capitalist institutions are not to be abolished, but secured, if only the other capitalists will become as cute as Mr. Cadbury and Mr. Lever and introduce "ameliorative measures." Instead of working for the establishment of a community of free citizens, co-operating as social equals, contributing, according to their ability, to the necessary work and enjoying, according to their needs, the good things of life, many of those posing as Socialists are merely striving after the establishment of the rule of a benevolent plutocracy, under which the workers may be well-fed, well-housed, and well-clothed, but will still be wage-slaves, subject to a master class.

That such a state of affairs may develop out of existing capitalist conditions is not at all improbable. The persistent advocacy of palliatives by the S.D.F., I.L.P., and other reform parties, the growing of the Garden City movement, the increasing number of capitalists who recognise that it pays to take "an interest" in their wage-slaves, the establishment of "model" factories, "model" villages, etc., all tend in this direction, and unless the issue is kept clear, the workers

will be side-tracked again. Hence the need for the S.P.G.B.

The merchant princes of the Cardiff Docks, says the *Evening News* correspondent, have decided to inaugurate a fund for the purchase of an annuity for the "Labour" Knight, and have subscribed £1000. Mr. Clifford Cory, M.P., being at the head of the movement, which is certain to succeed, Sir William Crossman being a most popular man by reason of his moderation as an advocate of labour. . . . The idea now is to get sufficient money invested to ensure him a reasonable annuity. The new knight does not fear going back to work, but, naturally, he would prefer an annuity. What ho!

The great political struggle of the future will be a struggle in which the radical party will have no place. The issues will be fought out between the principles of Socialism on the one hand and Imperialism on the other.

Rt. Hon. J. H. M. CAMPBELL, K.C., M.P., at United Club banquet.

Mr. Churchill, replying to Mr. Myer in the House of Commons, said in April last there were in the Transvaal mines 17,886 whites, 114,170 coloured labourers, and 53,114 Chinese. For April, 1906, the figures were 18,035 whites, 93,793 coloured, and 49,832 Chinese, showing a decrease of 149 whites, an increase of 20,731 coloured labourers, and of 3,282 Chinese.

And this is eighteen months since Sir H. C. Bannerman declared "we have abolished Chinese labour!"

The industrious, steady working man, who works hard through a long life, and brings up his family with affection and care, is a real national asset. He is, indeed, among the most valued possessions of any country, and since it is almost impossible for him to put by enough money to ensure his livelihood when work is no longer possible, he has a moral right to demand from the community comfort and sustenance in the evening of his days.

Thus the Pearson Paralyser. But what becomes of their argument that the Post Office, Building Society, Co-operative Society and other deposits represent working-class thrift, if it is almost impossible for the industrious, steady working man, who works hard through a long life, to put by etc.?

A few months ago capitalist politicians and writers were holding up their hands in pious horror at the revelations with regard to "graft" in America, declaring that English politics were so pure, you know.

Yet the letter of Mr. C. H. Lea, Liberal member for East St. Pancras, compelled some of them to make admissions. Mr. Lea accused the Government of selling peerages and other "honours" for contributions to the Party war chest. This war chest was used to help poor candidates whose votes, if elected, are looked upon as secure. "no matter what the issue, or what pledges may have been given to the constituents." To us it was no wonder that these practices of the Liberals should have been defended by the Tories, whose mouthpiece was Lord Robert Cecil.

Commenting on the debate the *Daily Graphic* said: it is an open secret that those who want titles must contribute to the Party funds. . . . Any respectable citizen who contributes handsomely to the funds of one or other of the political parties may, in the fulness of time, claim a title and get it. . . . We have established what we call democratic institutions, and we can only keep the machine running by the sale of aristocratic titles.

The *Daily News* also said: The practice of rewarding those who pay heavily to the party funds by giving them honours is not confined to one party. It is a recognised and rather squalid phase of the normal political game.

The receipt of a copy of this paper is an invitation to subscribe.

THE PROLETARIAT

(The Working Class).

By KARL KAUTSKY.

Specially translated for The Socialist Party of Great Britain and approved by the Author.

I. THE PROLETARIAN AND THE HANDICRAFTSMAN.

We have already seen in the previous chapter* that capitalist production pre-supposes the divorce of the worker from the means of production. In large capitalist concerns we find on the one hand the capitalist who possesses the means of production but does not himself take part in production; and on the other hand the wage-workers, the Proletarians, who possess nothing but their labour-power, by the sale of which they live, and whose labour alone creates the products of the large concern.

In order to obtain the number of wage-workers necessary to satisfy the requirements of Capital, it was, as we observed, in the beginning essential to rely upon the aid of force. To-day such aid is no longer needed. The advantage the large concern has over the small enterprise suffices to expropriate and throw upon the labour market year by year a sufficient number of peasants and handicraftsmen, who together with the progeny of the already "freed" wage-workers more than satisfy the capitalist craving for "new human flesh"; and this happens not only without infringing the laws of private property—but on the contrary by relying upon those laws.

That the number of Proletarians continually increases rapidly is so obvious that even those who would like to make us believe that Society is governed by the same conditions that prevailed a hundred and more years ago, and who are painting the future of small enterprise in the rosiest colours, do not venture to deny it.

Just as in production the large capitalist concern has become the dominant form of industrial enterprise, so in State and Society has the industrial wage-worker taken the most prominent place within the working class. This position was occupied four hundred years ago by the peasant, and a hundred years ago by the petty bourgeois.

The industrial wage-workers are already in all civilised countries the largest class; it is their conditions and views, which increasingly determine the mode of life and thought of the other sections of labour. But that means a complete revolution in the prevailing conditions of life and forms of thought among the great mass of the population; for the conditions of the wage-workers, particularly of the industrial Proletarians (and under the capitalist mode of production agriculture becomes also an industry), differ totally from those of former categories of labour.

When the peasant or handicraftsman was the free owner of his means of production he commanded also the full product of his labour. The labour-product of the wage-worker, however, does not belong to him, but to the capitalist, the purchaser of labour-power, the owner of the necessary means of production. It is true that the wage-worker is paid for his labour-power by the capitalist, but the value contained in his wages by no means equals the value of his product.

When the industrial capitalist purchases the commodity labour-power, he naturally does so with the intention of utilising it in a profitable manner. We have seen that a certain amount of labour creates a certain amount of value. The more the worker labours, the greater will (under otherwise equal conditions) be the value he produces. If the industrial capitalist would let the wage-worker, whom he has hired, work only so long as to produce a value equal to the wages he receives, the employer would make no profit. But even if the capitalist would like to pose as a benefactor of suffering mankind, capital calls for profit, and the capitalist does not turn a deaf ear to this call. The longer the worker toils in the service of capital beyond the labour time necessary for producing the value of his wages—that is to say, the greater surplus there is left—from the total product created by him after the value equivalent to his wages is deducted, the greater is the surplus value (as this excess value is called)

the greater is the exploitation of the worker, which finds a limit only in the exhaustion of the exploited and—in the possible resistance offered by him to the exploiter.

To the wage-worker private property in the instruments of production meant therefore from the outset something altogether different to what it signified to the handicraftsman or peasant; for while to these two it was originally the means of securing to them the complete ownership of their product; it has been for the wage-worker, and ever will be, nothing else but the means of exploiting him, of depriving him of the surplus value which he has created. The wage-worker from that standpoint is anything but a lover of "private property." And in this connection he not only distinguishes himself from the property-owning peasant and handicraftsman, but also from the handicraftsman of pre-capitalist times.

These journeymen formed the transition from the master handicraftsman to the Proletarian, just as the concerns in which they were employed in larger numbers form the transition from petty enterprise to large industrial concerns. Yet how different they were to the Proletarians!

They were treated as members of the master's family and they had the prospect of becoming masters themselves. But the wage-worker is only a hireling and condemned to remain a wage-worker. In these two points is summed up the cause for the difference between a handicraftsman and a wage-worker.

As the journeyman belonged to the family, he ate at the same table and slept in the house of his master, and the question of shelter and food did not exist as far as he was concerned. His wages in money was only a part of what he received from his master for his labour-power. The wages served less the purpose of satisfying the most necessary wants (which, as has been pointed out, were supplied by living with the master) than for the purpose of obtaining comforts or of saving, of accumulating the means required for setting up as master on his own account.

The journeyman worked together with the master. When the latter extended the hours of labour unusually, he was himself as much affected thereby as his assistant. There was therefore no strong desire on the part of the master to extend the working hours to the point of exhaustion, and even where that was the case, such intention was very easily restrained. Whenever the master endeavoured to make his own conditions of labour as agreeable as possible, the journeyman too, benefited thereby.

The instruments of production, which the small master required, were so few and simple that the craftsman did not need considerable means to set up as master. Every handicraftsman consequently had the opportunity of becoming a master; in fact, he already anticipated that position, and as he had to save in order to obtain the means to this end, he was as decided a defender of private property as the master craftsman.

It is necessary to point out that here the conditions of handicraft are being considered as they originally arose in pre-capitalist times.

Let us now compare with them the conditions of the wage-worker.

In capitalist industrial concerns wage-workers and capitalists are not active together; and although, in the course of economic development the industrial capitalist has acquired a separate identity from the merchant proper, and those of industry have become two distinct sections, the industrial capitalist, strictly speaking, still remains a merchant. His activity as capitalist—as far as he at all plays an active part in his undertaking—is limited, like that of the dealer, to the market. His duties are to purchase as suitably and cheaply as possible the necessary raw material, auxiliary materials, labour-power, etc., and to sell as dearly as possible the goods produced in his concern. In the sphere of production he has to do nothing else but to see to it, that the workers perform the largest amount of work possible for the smallest wages possible; that the largest amount of surplus value be squeezed out of them. The longer they work, the better for him. He does not get tired if the working hours are too long, he does not perish if the mode of production becomes a murderous one.

The capitalist is therefore far less considerate concerning the life and limb of the worker than was the master handicraftsman. The prolonging of the working day, the abolition of holidays, the introduction of night-work, the compulsion to work in damp or over-heated workshops, or places filled with noxious gases, etc.: these are the "improvements" which capitalist industrialism has brought to the worker.

The introduction of machinery has still further increased the dangers to the health and life of the worker. He is now chained to a monster which seizes upon him with gigantic strength and maddening speed. Only the closest, never faltering attention on the part of the worker attending such a machine prevents his being caught and crushed by it. Safety arrangements cost money, and the capitalist does not introduce them, unless he is compelled to do so. Economy is above all the main virtue of the capitalist; and that demands his limiting the space in his factory and finding room in it for as many machines as possible. What does it matter to him, if by so doing he endangers the workers' safety. Workmen are cheap; but large, commodious premises are dear.

But the capitalist method of applying machinery changes the conditions of the workers in yet another manner for the worse.

The tools of the handicraftsman were inexpensive, and seldom required such considerable alterations as would have caused them to become altogether useless. It is different with the machine. That costs money, much money. If it becomes prematurely useless, or is not worked to its full capacity, it will bring the capitalist loss instead of profit. But the machine wears out not only in use, but also when standing still. On the other hand the increasing application of science upon the economic domain, resulting as it did, in the invention of the machine, has the effect of continually producing new inventions and discoveries, sometimes of greater, sometimes of less significance, and constantly causing, now one, now another kind of machine, at times even the entire plant of a factory, to become incapable of keeping up with competition, and thus to lose their value before having been completely used up. Owing to this interrupted evolution in the technical aspect of machines, every one is in danger of becoming valueless before being used up. This circumstance affords the capitalist sufficient ground for using up every machine from the moment he purchases it as speedily as possible. That is to say, the application of machinery in production is a spur to the capitalist to extend the hours of labour, to carry on, if possible, an uninterrupted production, and to introduce the succession of day- and night-shifts, which means that the abominable practice of night work becomes a permanent institution.

When the application of machinery first began, some idealists declared that the millenium had come, that the machine would relieve the worker from his labour and make him a free man. But in the hand of the capitalist the machine has become the most powerful lever for the purpose of making the labour-burden of the proletarian a crushing one, and his servitude unbearable and murderous.

But it is not only in respect of the hours of labour that the wage-worker under the capitalist mode of production is worse off than the handicraftsman. The wage-worker does not eat at the table of the capitalist or live at his dwelling-house. He may dwell in most miserable quarters, feed upon refuse, why, even be in a starving condition, yet the comfort of the capitalist is not in the least disturbed thereby.

The meaning of the terms "starvation" and "wages" used to exclude one another. Then the free worker could only fall a victim to starvation if he was unable to find work. Everybody who worked had also to eat. The capitalist mode of production merits the distinction of having reconciled the two contradictions,—"starvation" and "wages"—and of having made "starvation-wages" a permanent institution, and even a mainstay of present society.

*See "From Handicraft to Capitalism."

D.V., W.P., etc., F. E. Dawkins, J. Kent and R. H. Kent will hold meetings as follows: August 18, Oxford; 19, Coventry; 20, Rugby; 21, Leicester; 22, Burton; 23, Derby; 24, Nottingham; 25, Manchester. Other comrades are invited to join.

ART, LABOUR, AND SOCIALISM.

By WM. MORRIS.

Reprinted from "To-Day."

I AM 'one of the people called Socialists,' therefore I am certain that evolution in the economical conditions of life will go on, whatever shadowy barriers may be drawn across its path by men whose apparent self interest binds them, consciously or unconsciously, to the present, and who are therefore hopeless for the future.

I hold that the condition of competition between man and man is bestial only, and that of association human: I think that the change from the undeveloped competition of the Middle Ages, trammelled as it was by the personal relations of feudality, and the attempts at association of the guild-craftsmen into the full-blown laissez-faire competition of the 19th century is bringing to birth out of its own anarchy, and by the very means by which it seeks to perpetuate that anarchy, a spirit of association founded on that antagonism which has produced all former changes in the condition of men, and which will one day abolish all classes and take definite and practical form, and substitute Socialism for competition in all that relates to the production and distribution of the means of life. I further believe that as that change will be beneficial in many ways, so especially will it give an opportunity for the new birth of art, which is now being crushed to death by the money-bags of competitive commerce.

My reason for this hope for art is founded on what I feel quite sure is a truth, and an important one, namely, that all art, even the highest, is influenced by the conditions of labour of the mass of mankind, and that any pretensions which may be made for even the highest intellectual art to be independent of these general conditions are futile and vain; that is to say, that any art which professes to be founded on the special education or refinement of a limited body or class, must of necessity be unreal and short-lived.

"Art is man's expression of his joy in labour." If those are not Professor Ruskin's words they embody at least his teaching on this subject. Nor has any truth more important ever been stated; for if pleasure in labour be generally stated, what a strange folly it must be for men to consent to labour without pleasure, and what a hideous injustice it must be for society to compel most men to labour without pleasure! For since all men not dishonest must labour, it becomes a question either of forcing them to lead unhappy lives or allowing them to live happily.

Now the chief accusation I have to bring against the modern state of society is that it is founded on the art-lacking or unhappy labour of the greater part of men, and all that external degradation of the face of the country of which I have spoken is hateful to me not only because it is a cause of unhappiness to some few of us who still love art, but also and chiefly because it is a token of the unhappy life forced on the great mass of the population by the system of competitive commerce.

The pleasure which ought to go with the making of every piece of handicraft has for its basis the keen interest which every healthy man takes in healthy life, and is compounded, it seems to me, chiefly of three elements—variety, hope of creation, and the self-respect which comes of a sense of usefulness, to which must be added that mysterious bodily pleasure which goes with the deft exercise of the bodily powers. I do not think I need spend many words in trying to prove that these things, if they really and fully accompanied labour, would do much to make it pleasant. As to the pleasures of variety, any of you who have ever made anything—I don't care what—will well remember the pleasure that went with the turning out of the first specimen. What would have become of that pleasure if you had been compelled to go on making it exactly the same for ever?

As to the hope of creation, the hope of producing some worthy or even excellent work, which, without you, the craftsman, would not have existed at all, a thing which needs you and can have no substitute for you in the making of it, can we any of us fail to understand the pleasure of this?

No less easy, surely, to see how much the self-respect born of the consciousness of usefulness must sweeten labour. To feel that you have to do a thing not to satisfy the whim of a fool or a set of fools, but because it is really good in itself, that is useful, would surely be a good help to getting through the day's work.

As to the unreasonable, sensuous pleasure in handiwork, I believe in good sooth that it has more power of getting rough and strenuous work out of men, even as things go, than most people imagine. At any rate it lies at the bottom of the production of all art, which cannot exist without it even in its feeblest and rudest form.

Now this compound pleasure in handiwork I claim as the birthright of all workmen. I say that if they lack any part of it they will be so far degraded, but that if they lack it altogether they are, so far as their work goes, I will not say slaves, the word would not be strong enough, but machines more or less conscious of their own unhappiness.

* * * * *

The craftsman of the Middle Ages no doubt often suffered grievous material oppression, yet in spite of the rigid line of separation drawn by the hierarchical system under which he lived between him and his feudal superior, the difference between them was arbitrary rather than real; there was no such gulf in language, manners and ideas as divides a cultivated middle-class person of to-day, 'a gentleman' from even a respectable lower class man; the mental qualities necessary to an artist—intelligence, fancy, imagination, had not then to go through the mill of the competitive market, nor had the rich (or successful competitors) made good their claim to be the sole possessors of mental refinement.

As to the conditions of handiwork in those days, the crafts were drawn together into guilds which indeed divided the occupations of men rigidly enough, and guarded the door to those occupations jealously; but as outside among the guilds there was little competition in the markets, wares being made in the first instance for domestic consumption, and only the overplus of what was wanted at home close to the place of production ever coming into the market or requiring any one to come and go between the producer and consumer, so inside the guilds there was but little division of labour; a man or youth once accepted as an apprentice to a craft learned it from end to end, and became as a matter of course the master of it; and in the earlier days of the guilds, when the masters were scarcely even small capitalists, there was no grade in the craft save this temporary one. Later on, when the masters became capitalists in a sort, and the apprentices were, like the masters, privileged, the class of journeymen craftsmen came into existence; but it does not seem that the difference between them and the aristocracy of the guild was anything more than an arbitrary one. In short, during all this period the unit of labour was an intelligent man.

Under this system of handiwork no great pressure of speed was put on a man's work, but he was allowed to carry it through leisurely and thoughtfully; it used the whole of a man for the production of a piece of goods, and not small portions of many men; it developed the workman's whole intelligence according to his capacity, instead of concentrating his energy on one-sided dealing with a trifling piece of work; in short, it did not submit the hand and soul of the workman to the necessities of the competitive market, but allowed them freedom for human development.

It was this system which had not learned the lesson that man was made for commerce, but supposed in its simplicity that commerce was made for man, which produced the art of the Middle Ages, wherein the harmonious co-operation of free intelligence was carried to the furthest point which has yet been attained, and which alone of all art can claim to be called Free.

The effect of this freedom, and the widespread or rather universal sense of beauty to which it gave birth, became obvious enough in the outburst of the expression of splendid and copious genius which marks the Italian Renaissance. Nor can it be doubted that this glorious art was the fruit of the five centuries of free and

popular art which preceded it, and not of the rise of commercialism which was contemporaneous with it; for the glory of the Renaissance faded out with strange rapidity as commercial competition developed. So that at about the end of the 17th century, both in the intellectual and the decorative arts the commonplace or body still existed, but the romance or soul of them was gone. Step by step they had faded and sickened before the advance of commercialism, now speedily gathering force throughout civilisation. The domestic or architectural arts were becoming (or become) mere toys for the competitive market through which all material wares used by civilised men now had to pass. Commercialism had by this time well nigh destroyed the craft-system of labour, in which, as aforesaid, the unit of labour is a fully instructed craftsman, and had supplanted it by what I will ask leave to call the workshop system, wherein, when complete, division of labour in handiwork is carried to the highest point possible, and the unit of manufacture is no longer a man, but a group of men, each member of which is dependent on his fellows, and is utterly useless by himself. This system of the workshop division of labour was perfected during the 18th century by the efforts of the manufacturing classes, stimulated by the demands of the ever-widening markets; it is still the system in some of the smaller and more domestic kinds of manufacture, holding much the same place amongst us as the remains of the craft-system did in the days when that of the workshop was still young. Under this system, as I have said, all the romance of the arts died out, but the commonplace of them flourished still; for the idea that the essential aim of manufacture is the making of goods still struggled with a newer idea which has since obtained complete victory, namely, that it is carried on for the sake of making a profit for the manufacturer on the one hand, and on the other for the employment of the working class.

This idea of commerce being an end in itself and not a means merely, being but half developed in the 18th century, the special period of the workshop system, some interest could still be taken in those days in the making of wares. The capitalist manufacturer of the period had some pride in turning out goods which would do him credit, as the phrase went; he was not willing wholly to sacrifice his pleasure in this kind to the imperious demands of commerce; even his workman, though no longer an artist, that is a free workman, was bound to have skill in his craft, limited though it was to the small fragment of it which he had to toil at day by day for his whole life.

But commerce went on growing, stimulated still more by the opening up of new markets, and pushed on the invention of men, till their ingenuity produced the machines which we have now got to look upon as necessities of manufacture, and which have brought about a system the very opposite to the ancient craft-system; that system was fixed and conservative of methods; there was no real difference in the method of making a piece of goods between the time of Pliny and the time of Sir Thomas More; the method of manufacture, on the contrary, in the present time, alters not merely from decade to decade, but from year to year; this fact has naturally helped the victory of this machine system, the system of the Factory, where the machine-like workmen of the workshop period are supplanted by actual machines, of which the operatives as they are now called are but a portion, and a portion gradually diminishing both in importance and numbers. This system is still short of its full development, therefore to a certain extent the workshop system is being carried on side by side with it, but is being speedily and steadily crushed out by it; and when the process is complete, the skilled workman will no longer exist, and his place will be filled by machines directed by a few highly trained and very intelligent experts, and tended by a multitude of people, men, women and children, of whom neither skill nor intelligence is required.

This system, I repeat, is as near as may be the opposite of that which produced the popular art which led up to that splendid outburst of art in the days of the Italian Renaissance which even cultivated men will sometimes deign to notice now-a-days; it has therefore produced the opposite of what the old craft-system produced, the death of art and not its birth; in other words

the degradation of the external surroundings of life—or simply and plainly unhappiness—through all society spreads that curse of unhappiness; from the poor wretches, the news of whom we middle-class people are just now receiving with such naïf wonder and horror; from those poor people whom nature forces to strive against hope, and to expend all the divine energy of man in competing for something less than a dog's lodging and a dog's food, from them up to the cultivated and refined person, well lodged, well fed, well clothed, expensively educated, but lacking all interest in life except it may be the cultivation of unhappiness as a fine art.

(To be continued.)

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

J. T. Tyson.—Next month.
"Comp." (Poplar).—Mr. G. Geis is a member of the S.L.P., not of this Party. The rule which you quote that "no official of a Trade Union or any other organisation supporting or affiliated with any other political party shall be eligible for membership of the Party" is an S.L.P. rule. Whether you are right in claiming that Mr. Geis broke this rule by acting as a Delegate to the Q. D. M. of the L.S.C., as reported in the December issue of the "London Typographical Journal" is not a matter for us to decide.

BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, &c. to be obtained of the S.P.G.B., 22, Great James St., London, E.C.
CAPITAL (Karl Marx) ... 5s. 6d.
SIX CENTURIES OF WORK AND WAGES (Thorold Rogers) ... 5s. 6d.
POVERTY (Rowntree) ... 4s. 6d.
SOCIALIST STANDARD Vols. I, II, & III, (Bound) each 3s. 0d.
MANIFESTO AND RULES of the S.P.G.B. ... 1½d.
FROM HANDICRAFT TO CAPITALISM (Kautsky) 1½d.
COMMUNIST MANIFESTO ... 2½d.
WAGE LABOUR & CAPITAL (Marx) 1½d.
ALL POST FREE.

MANIFESTO

OF THE

Socialist Party

of Great Britain.

Second Edition, with preface, now ready.

Explains the Party's position towards the S.D.F., I.L.P., Fabian Society, Trade Unions, S.L.P., etc.

Price - - One Penny.

Post free 1½d. per copy from the S.P.G.B., 22, Great James Street, London, W.C.
The Trade supplied by Henderson, 16, Paternoster Row, London, E.C.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

HEAD OFFICE:

22, GREAT JAMES STREET, LONDON, W.C.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—A. Jones, Secretary, 3, Mathew St., Latchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at S.P.G.B. Laburnam House, 134, High Street, Battersea, S.W. Club open every evening.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Executive Committee. Applications should be sent to the General Secretary.

EAST HAM.—W. Gifford, Sec., 31, Maryland Square, Stratford. Branch meets Mondays at 7.30 at 447, Katherine Rd., Forest Gate.

EDMONTON.—Sidney Auty, Sec. 60, Gilpin Grove, Edmonton. Branch meets Wednesdays 8.30.

FULHAM.—E. Waller, Secretary, 45, Warple Way, Wandsworth, S.W. Branch meets June 3 and alternate Mondays at 8 at Ingram's Coffee Tavern, Fulham Cross.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Fri. at 8.30 at 79, Grove Rd., Holloway. Communications to the Sec.

PADDINGTON.—Communications to F. Linfield, 18, Goldney Rd., Paddington, W. Branch meets every Wednesday, 8.30 p.m., at Harley's Coffee Tavern (foot of Lock Bridge), Harrow Rd.

PECKHAM.—W. Wren, Sec., 91, Evelina Rd., Nunhead, S.E. Branch meets every Wed. at 8.30

ROMFORD DIVISION.—All communications to the Secretary, S.P.G.B. Club, 39, York Road, Ilford. Branch meets Mondays at 8 at Club.

TOOTING.—P. Dumenil, Secretary, 36, Byton Road, Tooting, S.W. Branch meets every Wed. at 8 p.m. at Gorrings Dining Rooms, Gorrings Park Parade, Tooting Junction.

TOTTENHAM.—T. Lobb, Sec. Branch meets Mon. 8 at p.m., at Sunbeam Coffee Tavern, High Rd.

WATFORD.—T. Wilkins, Sec., 4, Marlborough Rd., Branch meets alternate Fridays at 8 p.m.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Mondays 7.30, followed at 8.30 by discussion, at 447, Katherine Road, Forest Gate.

WOOD GREEN.—H. Crump, Secretary, 39, Hermitage Road, Harringay, N. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Mondays at 8.30 at 2, Station Road, Wood Green.

WOOLWICH & PLUMSTEAD.—A. E. Rance, Sec., 44, Brookdene Rd., Plumstead. Branch meets on 2nd and 4th Wednesdays in month at 80, Conway Road, Plumstead.

INFORMATION

concerning the Party can be obtained of the following
BRADFORD (Yorks).—Ben Wilde, 78, Godwin St.
BURTON-ON-TRENT.—J. Blundell, 157, New St.
LIVERPOOL.—J. M. O. Sullivan, 4, Laburnam Grove, Litherland.
MANCHESTER.—J. Marsh, 97, Blantyre Street, Swinton, Nr. Manchester.

TO NEWSAGENTS.

"The Socialist Standard" and all other publications of The Socialist Party of Great Britain are supplied to the trade by Henderson's, 16, Paternoster Row, London, E.C.

THE

SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

HOLDS

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master-class, and the consequent enslavement of the working-class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working-class from the domination of the master-class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working-class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist-class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working-class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working-class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master-class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

APPLICATION FOR MEMBERSHIP.

To the Secretary,

.....Branch, S.P.G.B.

I hereby declare my adhesion to the above principles, and request enrolment as a member of The Socialist Party of Great Britain.

Signature.....

Address.....

Date.....

S.P.G.B. LECTURE LIST. AUG., 1907.

SUNDAYS.		4th.	11th.	18th.	25th.
Battersea, Prince's Head	11.30	J. Fitzgerald	H. Newman	T. A. Jackson	J. McManus
" "	7.30	T. A. Jackson	J. McManus	H. Newman	T. A. Jackson
Clapham Common	3.30	J. Fitzgerald	E. Fairbrother	T. A. Jackson	H. Newman
Finsbury Park	3.30	A. Anderson	J. Fitzgerald	J. Crump	F. C. Watts
Fulham, op. site Salisbury Hotel	7.30	E. Fairbrother	T. W. Allen	F. C. Watts	J. Fitzgerald
Ilford, Roden Street	7.30	R. H. Kent	A. Anderson	J. Fitzgerald	W. A. Cole
Jolly Butchers' Hill	11.30	J. Crump	R. H. Kent	T. W. Allen	H. C. Phillips
Manor Park Broadway	11.30	R. J. Kent	F. E. Dawkins	W. A. Cole	J. Crump
Paddington, Prince of Wales	11.30	F. C. Watts	F. E. Dawkins	W. Gifford	J. Fitzgerald
Plaistow, op. site Abbey Arms	11.30	F. E. Dawkins	J. Kent	J. Fitzgerald	J. H. Kennett
Tooting Broadway	7.30	J. McManus	T. A. Jackson	E. Fairbrother	T. W. Allen
Tottenham, West Green Cnr.	11.30	A. Anderson	A. Anderson	A. Anderson	A. Anderson
" "	7.30	H. Newman	J. Fitzgerald	A. Anderson	A. Anderson
MONDAYS.		5th.	12th.	19th.	26th.
Ilford, Roden St.	8.30	J. Kent	F. E. Dawkins	W. A. Cole	H. C. Phillips
WEDNESDAYS.		7th.	14th.	21st.	28th.
Highbury Corner	8.30	J. Fitzgerald	T. A. Jackson	J. Fitzgerald	F. E. Dawkins
Walham Green Broadway	8.30	E. Fairbrother	H. Newman	T. A. Jackson	T. W. Allen
THURSDAYS.		8th.	15th.	22nd.	29th.
North Kensington, corner of Golborne & Bevington Rds.	8.30	T. W. Allen	F. C. Watts	T. W. Allen	F. C. Watts
Tottenham, West Green Cnr.	8.30	A. Anderson	A. Anderson	A. Anderson	A. Anderson
FRIDAYS.		9th.	16th.	23rd.	30th.
Battersea, Prince's Head	8.30	T. A. Jackson	Fawcett & Roe	T. A. Jackson	E. Fairbrother
Paddington, Prince of Wales	8.30	F. C. Watts	J. H. Halls	F. C. Watts	T. W. Allen
Tooting Broadway	8.30	P. Dumenil	J. McManus	H. Newman	P. Dumenil

Printed by A. Jacomb, Globe Press, Forest Lane, Stratford, for the Proprietors, The Socialist Party of Great Britain, and published at 22, Great James Street, London.

The
Official Organ
of
The
Socialist Party
of
Great Britain.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

No. 37. Vol. 4.]

LONDON, SEPTEMBER, 1907.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

THE SINN FEIN POLICY.

The
Policy
Fore-
shadowed.

"I HAD come to the conclusion that the whole system ought to be met with resistance at every point; and the means for this would be extremely simple: a combination amongst the people to obstruct and render impossible the transport and shipment of Irish provisions; to refuse all aid in its removal; to destroy the highways; to prevent everyone, by intimidation, from daring to bid for grain or cattle if brought to auction under distress (a method of obstruction that had put an end to church tithes before); in short, to offer a passive resistance universally, but occasionally, when opportunity served, to try the steel."

The above lines were written by John Mitchell in 1847 when the Irish Confederation refused to endorse his policy of immediate resistance to the collection of rents, rates, and taxes. The portion relating to the transport and shipment of Irish goods referred to the exportation of Irish produce in a time when the country was devastated by famine and thousands were dying of starvation.

Parnell's proposition to the Nationalist members, "to withdraw from the British House of Commons and organise the people in Ireland to resist English rule at every point" was defeated on a vote of the party.

The idea of carrying on a campaign of passive resistance to British rule in Ireland is therefore not by any means new, but the Sinn Fein Party is the first party that has attempted to organise the people for this object. It has already succeeded in winning over the youngest and most ardent of the Irish race; it has converted four of the official Nationalist members of Parliament including one of their whips, Sir T. G. Esmonde. At a meeting of the Nationalist Party in the House of Commons it was proposed and seconded that the Party adopt the Sinn Fein policy and withdraw from Westminster. In North Leitrim the member, Mr. Dolan, having embraced the new doctrine, is about to contest the seat against the official Nationalist candidate.

The Sinn Fein Party claim to have a majority in favour of their policy in the County and District Councils in the country, and Mr. Sweetman, chairman of the Meath County Council, at the meeting of councillors from various counties proposed and caused to be discussed at length a resolution to this effect: "that we refuse to collect any more rates or taxes." Thus we see that the Sinn Fein policy will probably in the future be the method adopted throughout Ireland to resist and if possible destroy the domination of "the thrice accursed British Empire."

What is the nature and origin of the Sinn Fein movement? The words Sinn Fein mean "ourselves alone," and those who are acquainted with Ireland know that within the last ten years a movement was set on foot for the restoration of the Irish language, customs, industries, music and art; started and organised by the Gaelic League it was at first strictly non-political and non-sectarian, its ultimate object was an Irish Ireland, everything in language, clothing,

manner and sport which was not originally Irish was banned and ridiculed, and the offenders were termed "Shoneens," "Flunkeys," and "West Britons." The Gaelic League was a decided success and it did not exist long before it had a political party formed independent of all others and having for its object "Ireland a Nation," not in the sense of a British colony, but independent of all external authority. This party was formed on the same basis as Wolf Tone a century ago formed the "United Irishmen," and like Tone it wanted "to unite Catholic, Protestant, and Dissenter under the common name of Irishman." "Our independence must be had at all hazards; if the men of property will not support us they must fall; we can support ourselves by the aid of that numerous and respectable class of the community the men of no property." Thus we see the Sinn Fein Party is the child of the Irish education movement, and is alluded to by the Parliamentarians as the "crowd of intellectuals," "arm-chair agitators," etc.

The Sinn Fein Party is now possessed of several weekly journals that voice its views. It has also published a large number of pamphlets that have aided considerably in bringing the Party to its present position. In their weekly journals the Sinn Feiners riddle the arguments of the Parliamentarians, they point to the fact that in 1847 the population of Ireland was 9 millions, while to-day it is about 4 millions after over half a century of labour on the "flure of the House." That the Land Acts were fraudulent and did not even touch the question of the poverty problem, that a Liberal Government is now in office but not officially pledged to Home Rule; in short, that the Nationalist Party is ineffective as a weapon against British misrule in Ireland.

The Sinn Fein Party propose the immediate withdrawal from Westminster of the 82 Irish members and that the £30,000 now annually spent in maintaining this useless weapon be spent in sending consuls to foreign countries to open up markets for Irish goods. That all monies invested in the banks in Ireland at the present time be withdrawn and a People's Bank be formed to lend money and transact all business at interest to cover only the cost of management. That a National Stock Exchange be formed in Dublin. That the people refuse to pay rent, rates, or taxes, and that the County Councils and other such bodies responsible refuse to collect same. That, if possible, no articles from which the British Government derives a revenue be consumed by the people. That the money saved in rent, rates, and administration be used in fixing machinery and re-starting the disused mills and factories, to revive dying industries and introduce new ones. That, in short, by common consent, by means of duly elected members or a general council of the County and District Councils the people of Ireland will refuse to recognise English law, authorities, or customs, and that henceforth Ireland shall be ruled only by the will of the

people of Ireland.

Some of the chief spokesmen of this movement are large land owners and capitalists. Mr. John Sweetman owns a large tract of land in C. Meath, is a county councillor, railway director, etc. Edward Martyn is a landowner of County Galway, a J.P. and is the exact reflex of the English capitalist. Sir T. G. Esmonde, Bart, M.P., is a bank director, railway director, and landlord. These and many others connected with the Sinn Fein movement give as their principal reason for supporting it the insecurity of their stock, the railways are not making any profit worth speaking of, the canals are idle, and so on.

From this it is quite evident that **But is** if the Sinn Fein movement succeeds **itself** profits are intended to rise at the expense of the Irish worker. **Futile,** The Irish capitalist class is still to remain the proud possessor of the land, factories, mills, railways, etc., and readers of this journal know what that means for the poor wretches employed.

The proud boast of the Sinn Fein Party is that Hungary was placed in much the same position under Austria as Ireland is under England, and that when Hungary established her independence in exactly the same manner as the Sinn Fein movement proposes Ireland should, her trade increased by leaps and bounds, her population increased and new industries were developed, yet we know that to-day the Magyar is as much a slave as ever, and that there are in Hungary workhouses, prisons, asylums, unemployed, and all the other characteristics of the capitalist system. We know that the trade of Great Britain was greater last year than ever before, and that last year was nevertheless for the workers a year of great unemployment, poverty and privation. Even regarding the present success of the Sinn Fein movement it may be pointed out that the prospect differs vitally from that of Hungary in the important fact that Hungary was almost the equal in population and strength of Austria, and so was able to command political success. Hungary was also helped by the important tactical position it occupied as a barrier against Russian and Turkish advance. But as far as the condition of the people is concerned the Hungarian worker is not one whit better off than the Irish worker, whilst emigrants from Hungary may be counted by the hundred thousand, by whom, it is evident, the foreign exploiters are found at least no worse than the Hungarian masters from whom they flee.

In view of these facts it is our duty to warn our fellow-workers in Ireland of the futility of the Sinn Fein policy as far as they are concerned. There can be no relief for the oppressed Irishman in changing an English robber for an Irish one. The person of the robber does not matter—it is the fact of the robbery that spells misery. National divisions are a hindrance to working-class unity and action, and national jealousies and differences

are fostered by the capitalists for their own ends.

The crowd of hungry "intellectuals" clamouring for jobs both within and without the Irish parliamentary group do not represent the interests of the working class in Ireland. They do not, indeed, profess to favour other than capitalist interests, provided that the landlord or capitalist be Irish, but the Irish capitalist is in no wise more merciful than the English exploiter. The national sentiment and perennial enthusiasm of the Irishmen are being exploited by the so-called leaders in the interests of Irish capitalism, and the workers are being used to fight the battles of their oppressors. The Irish capitalist rebels against the English capitalist only because the latter stands in the way of a more thorough exploitation of the Irish workers by Irish capital. Let the thieves fight their own battles! For the worker in Ireland there is but one hope. It is to join the Irish wing of the international Socialist working class and to make common cause with the Socialist workers of all countries for the end of all forms of exploitation; saying to both English and Irish capitalists: "A plague on both your houses." For the true battle-cry of the working class is broader, more significant and more inspiring than mere nationalism, and that rallying cry is:

THE WORLD FOR THE WORKERS!

J. McMANUS.

A LOOK ROUND.

The spread of civilisation, as it is called, in India, is bringing with it other things besides political agitation, the boycott, and the factory system. In the train of the latter is coming also the strong drink habit.

Daily Chronicle, Aug. 2nd.

Reformers, particularly "temperance" ones, should note the sequence—civilisation—factory system—strong drink habit.

In this connection it is well to recall the words of the Bishop of London, uttered at the Mansion House in November, 1905. "Wherever British Commerce" he said "came into contact with native races it inflicted upon them the most terrible injury it was possible for human agency to inflict."

The effect of the factory system upon the people of Lancashire and Yorkshire was ably described by Mr. Redgrave, Inspector of Factories, in 1875. He traced the development of textile manufactures and showed how the factory hands degenerated "from the sturdy labourer and operative in the valleys and on the hill-sides of Lancashire and Yorkshire to the wasted and down-trodden operative of the purely manufacturing town . . . until the factory population appeared to have become a distinct race, that was known at a glance, so defined were the effects of overwork and unhealthy dwellings upon the physical appearance and condition of the people."

And in the same year Dr. Leach, of Heywood, certifying surgeon to the district, dealt with the evil effects on the operatives of "transitions from the mills and the irregular temperature to their own dwellings; diet and drinks adapted to a heated employment, and stimulants to soothe an excited nervous tension." And he regretted that drink stimulants and mental excitement were resorted to, but what else could be expected.

Remember! the majority of the Factory Owners were Liberals and the Liberal Party opposed all the factory acts designed to improve the lot of the operative.

The people of Lancashire and Yorkshire are still suffering from the effects of the factory system. Anemic and excitable, they still fly to stimulants, and according to Dr. Davy, are indulging in that most harmful practice—excess-

sive tea drinking.

Speaking at a breakfast given at Exeter on August 1st by the National Temperance League, Dr. Davy, president of the British Medical Association, said that teetotal advocates talked most unscientific twaddle. Evidence before a Royal Commission showed that in large towns like Manchester tea soaked on the hob was producing physical deterioration of the worst form. In his opinion, a meal of cheese, bread and light beer was infinitely more scientific than a meal of bread, tea, and jam.

Mr. Arnold Lupton, M.P., a vice-president of the Land Nationalisation Society, wrote to the Daily Express on July 30th protesting against being dubbed a Socialist. "I advocate," he said, "nationalisation of the land as the best way of resisting Socialism, and there are many others who agree with me. We think that land nationalisation, carried out in a reasonable manner, is the best means of dealing with those admitted defects in our social system which are used by Socialists as their chief arguments in favour of Socialism."

This is lovely! Have we not time after time pointed out that the opponents of Socialism will back any reform that will lead back the Socialist movement. And yet professing Socialists continue to fall into the trap so adroitly set for them.

"The people are hungering for live truths; they will not be content with the bloodless futility of the Bells, Maddisons, and Fenwicks."

F. H. Ross in *Clarion*, July 26th, 1907.

It is stated that arrangements are almost completed for joint action between the Labour members and the Liberal Labour members in the House of Commons. Several joint meetings have been held and all questions of principle settled. There remain one or two matters of detail to be further discussed!

So the people who are "hungering for live truths" are to be given the "bloodless futility of the Bells, Maddisons and Fenwicks" diluted with the ditto of the McDonalds, Thornes and Shackletons!

Some of us were inclined to think that when Mr. Curran became M.P. for Fallow he would, at any rate, make a fight of some sort in the "House." But it's best not to expect anything. Hardly was he elected when he appeared at Edmonton apologising for the barren results of the Labour Party's activities.

At Canning Town on August 9th he told how on the previous day he received four wires asking him to do something in reference to the strike at Belfast. He went to the Speaker and told him he would move the adjournment of the House. The Speaker said it would be against the rules to do so. He did not say anything then but went outside the House and said "Damn the rules."

This bravery reminds me of that other Irishman who told his friend that he had had an awful row with the boss but had got the best of it. "I called him all the damned thieves, and blackguards, and liars, and humbugs I could think of." "And what did he say?" said his friend. "Oh," replied the first, "he didn't hear me."

"For sensibility, adaptability, and respectability," said the president of the last Conference, "the Labour Party in the House of Commons stands first." Evidently Mr. Curran doesn't wish to give any capitalist politicians the opportunity of saying that he is less respectable than the others.

The capitalist Press has recently been devoting much space to Socialism, which, of course, it has interpreted to suit its own purposes. Amongst the most amusing contributions were those in the *Referee* for August 4th, wherein

several correspondents drew gloomy pictures of what would happen should the "shy bird" Capital take fright and withdraw to foreign climes.

One writer, "Frank Alwin" set out to state "The Case for Capital" and proved himself a most amusing fellow. He said: "Consider of what our enormous capital consists. In their relative order of size, the items are approximately as follows: Houses, land, foreign loans and investments, furniture and clothing, railways and canals, roads and public buildings, merchandise, hay, corn, &c., factories, shipping, gas and water works, live stock, navy (docks and fortifications), coin and bullion." And he added, "It may surprise some people to know that one quarter of our capital consists of houses, and the gold and silver coin constitutes only one-hundredth part of it."

It is generally admitted that the money in the United Kingdom amounts to about £100,000,000 only. It is, therefore, quite easy to understand what a financial crisis would result if the Post Office and Trustee Savings Bank Depositors, to say nothing of Shareholders in Co-operative Societies and the like, all wished to withdraw their deposits at one time! On December 31st, 1906, the amount due to depositors in the Post Office Savings Bank alone was £155,996,446.

A perusal of Mr. Alwin's list will show to what extent this "capital" could be removed. Perhaps the working class would enjoy more sleep at nights if the portion owned by them (the "live stock") were taken, say, to the North Pole!

It is not often that the method by which Capitalism creates the unemployed is so openly admitted as was the case in the prospectus recently issued by Champion & Slee, Ltd., Vinegar Brewers. Two of the directors, H. H. Slee and John Wright, signed a Report under date May 15th, in which they said: "In view of the amalgamation of the businesses of Messrs. Champion & Co. and Messrs. Slee, Slee, & Co. Ltd., at one factory and under one management, and of the combined demand being met by one set of workmen and one staff, we are of opinion that the expenses of manufacture and supply to the trade will, on a conservative estimate, be reduced to the following extent, namely: Wages and Salaries, £4,250; Stables, £750; Advertising, £597; Insurance, £58; Trade Expenses, £438; and Purchases, £1,000; making a total of £7,093 per annum; and that, on the same volume of trade, the profits should be increased by this sum."

So that out of a total estimated saving of £7,093, labour saved would amount to £4,250. And this would not be all, because the other items represent in their turn a saving of labour. Clerical and manual workers will be discharged. In the capitalist order of things these will be the older and less competent. And if some of the discharged, after vainly trying to get employment, drift lower and lower and finally take to drink, the "temperance" wiseacres will point to them as awful examples of the havoc caused by drink.

There is no hope for the working-class, employed or unemployed, while Capitalism lasts. Socialism alone will end their misery and free them for ever from the uncertainties of existence incidental to Capitalism.

During the British Pharmaceutical Conference last month the members paid a visit to the Warrington Works of Joseph Crosfield & Sons, Ltd. The *Daily News* young man who accompanied the visitors was enthusiastic when reporting. "Cheerfulness is encouraged" he wrote, "and the hundreds of rosy-cheeked maidens, clad in blue smocks and red sun bonnets, sing gaily at their work." How lovely! What kind, considerate employers! Eh! What? "The manager tells you it breaks the monotony, and, in a confidential whisper, that it increases the output." Ours are the italics.

J. KAY.

PEACE AMONGST THE NATIONS.

WAR BETWEEN THE CLASSES.

The months of July and August were full of interesting events.

The *Daily News* of July 31st referred to one of these in its leading article, headed "The Palace of Peace." Its language was sublime. "The foundation stone of Mr. Carnegie's Palace of Peace was laid yesterday at the Hague to an accompaniment of oratory which does credit to the optimism of the great" and the poster it issued on the same day bore remarkable evidences of the peaceful intentions of British capitalists, who were represented at the Hague. As the events which that Contents Bill had reference to will one day play as important a part in working-class politics as, one day, the Featherstone massacres will, let us reproduce it:

MILITARY
POURING INTO
BELFAST

RAILWAY CRISIS

Since then, the power of the master class has been demonstrated in the usual manner. Controlling "the machinery of Government, including the armed forces of the nation" those armed forces have been used, as they must always be, "to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers," and at time of writing, the hospitals are filled with wounded wage-slaves while preparations are being made for the internment of the killed.

Two days previously, this same organ of British Nonconformity admitted, in its leader on the Idaho trial, that—

The trial . . . more and more became a class struggle between capital and labour, and that—

From the beginning the question has been complicated by the fierce prejudices of a kind of smouldering class war. . . . The whole movement . . . has illustrated the insecurity of authority in America, and the profound scepticism concerning the identity of law and justice.

The *American Commercial Appeal* said in the course of an editorial reviewing the Idaho trial:—

Now, however much we may dislike disorder, we are bound as fair-minded citizens to abide by the evidence adduced in a case. Much disorder was started on both sides. The mine owners were guilty of more infamous crimes than were ever charged against the miners. They had judges and other officers driven from their posts. They had merchants who leaned toward the miners' side deported from their homes. They bought up the legislature to overturn the will of the people. Peabody stole the governorship of Colorado, and then, his nerve weakening, he turned the office over to the lieutenant-governor. The supreme court of Colorado, in league with the mine owners, took charge of the state election and helped to steal the state for the Republican party.

Colorado and some other Western states have been in recent years about as bad as Russia. The source of the trouble has, of course, been the defiance of all law and order by the mine owners. Very few people realise just what these people have done and just what provocation to violence they have given the miners. They corrupted the legislature to kill the eight-hour law that the people had voted for by a large majority. They established the bull-pen, in which hundreds of innocent people were herded like cattle. They had the writ of habeas corpus abolished. They had men driven from their homes and business not only because they were union miners but because they were merchants who sympathised with miners. They threatened to hang judges and other officers if they did not resign. They violated all the prerogatives of American citizens.

A week later the *Daily Telegraph's* Amsterdam correspondent wrote:

Another war between capital and labour . . . is on the tapis . . . Organised labour is being met by organised capital, and the lesson which Sir George Livesey taught many years ago, when the gasworkers of South London went out on strike, has evidently not been lost upon the Shipping Federation, who seem to be adopting a similar course . . . by drawing free labour from England to replace the strikers if necessary. . . . The Labourers' Union claims to be a powerful body, but the Shipping Federation is still more powerful, having the support of capital as well as the law of the land!

International Peace is in the air, but War, the Class War, the inevitable war between

capitalist and labourer is on the Earth. And the capitalists are prepared to use any means, like Carnegie, to crush their wage-slaves, and the capitalist governments who are most ready to send troops to shoot down workers in revolt like America, and France, and Russia, and last but not least, Great Britain, play the foremost parts in the farce of international peace "doing credit to the optimism of the great." Even before the peace conference closed its doors, and as a commentary on the Liberal Premier's famous peace oration, Great Britain has decided to lay down "almost immediately" three more battleships of the Dreadnought type—with improvements.

Without entering into the details of the Belfast dispute, one or two matters may be noted. It is "loyal Ulster" that is the scene of this seething discontent, the portion of the Emerald Isle which has always been held up as a shining example to the remainder. Agrarian outrages are not prevalent and although a feud exists between the Protestants and the Catholics the present struggle is not between these. Christian no longer hurls bricks at Christian as such; Loyalist no longer pursues Nationalist, or vice versa. No, all these minor differences are forgotten in the greater struggle, that between Capital and Labour. "The line of division," says the *Daily News* Parliamentary representative, "is not Catholic and Protestant or Nationalist and Orangeman, but, simply, Labour and Capital." And here, before the echoes of the oratory at the foundation stone laying of the Palace of Peace have died away, (dimmed somewhat by the noise of the French bombardment of the Moorish towns), the new short rifle of the British Army has been tested in real earnest—in the interests of Capital as against Labour, just as the first Lee-Metford bullets found their human billets at Featherstone in 1893. And a Liberal Government is in office now, as then. Here at home, then, with a "wise and good" monarch, with a Liberal Government, with Free Trade, with a Labour Party in Parliament, with working-men magistrates and working men knights, the class war exists and until the cause of it has been removed no peace is possible. In "protectionist and prosperous America," then, and in "loyal" Ulster, the "smouldering class war" breaks out into open conflict, as in all other parts of the world.

The ordinary wars for the extension of markets, or for taking away the attention of the people at home from social evils, (the present "military operations" of the French against the Moors have probably been undertaken with both objects in view, considering the recent trouble in the Midi), pale into insignificance beside the War of the Classes which has yet to be prosecuted in grim earnest by the workers all over the world. The mouthpieces at the Hague Conference may discuss their arrangements for the struggles for the "awag" in which they from time to time engage, with members of the working class as the active participants and sufferers, but the time is rapidly approaching when they will sink their petty differences and unite as the forces of International Capital opposed to International Labour. There can be only one end to the War of the Classes—the abolition of the classes. As the Manifesto of the S.P.G.B. points out: "In the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, therefore the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex."

Speed the day.

K.

Great minds do, indeed, react on the Society which has made them what they are; but they only pay with interest what they have received.—*Macaulay*.

It is curious to note that as soon as one is faced by a real human problem one finds no alternative between Unionism and Socialism.—*Daily Express*.

Although Mr. Lloyd-George is an advanced Radical he has always been a keen man of business, and his recent pronouncement on railway affairs did not by any means come as a surprise to his friends. It might, indeed, be said of him, that he is an admirable representative of the middle classes.—*London Opinion*.

The Materialist Conception of History.

The first of the important discoveries with which the name of Marx is associated in the history of science, is the conception of the world's history. All conception of history previous to him is founded on the idea that the ultimate causes of all historic changes are found in the changing ideas of men, and again, that of all historic changes the political are the most important, controlling the whole of history. But whence these ideas are derived by men, and what are the moving causes of political changes, nobody had even enquired. Only in the recent school of French, and partly also of English, historians, the conviction had forced itself that at least since the Middle Ages the driving force in European history was the struggle of the developing bourgeoisie with the feudal nobility for the social and political supremacy. Marx, however, demonstrated that all history has been hitherto a history of class struggles, that all the numerous and intricate political struggles were carried on only for the sake of the social and political supremacy of different classes in society; for the maintenance of the supremacy by older, for the establishment of supremacy by newly rising classes.

Through what agency, now, do these classes rise and exist? Through the pressure of those material and physical conditions under which the society of a given time produces and exchanges its means of subsistence. The feudal reign of the Middle Ages was based on the self-sufficient and almost exchangeless management of small farming communities, producing nearly all their own necessities and receiving from the warlike nobility protection against external foes, and national, or at least political, coherence. When the towns arose and with them a separate branch of skilled industry and a trade first confined to the home market, but later on vying international, then the civic element of the towns developed and, fighting the nobility, obtained even during the Middle Ages its admission as a likewise privileged class into the feudal order. But by the discovery of new lands outside of Europe in the middle of the fifteenth century, the bourgeoisie obtained a far more extended territory for its trade and hence a new incentive to industry; skilled labour was displaced in the most important branches by more factory-like production which, in its turn met the same fate through industrial organisation on a large scale made possible by the inventions of the 18th century, especially the steam engine. These industries reacted on trade by displacing manual labour in the more backward countries and creating in the further advanced countries the present new means of communication, steam-engines, railways, electric telegraphs. Thus the bourgeoisie united more and more the social wealth and the social power in its own hands, though for a long time it still remained excluded from the political power which still rested in the hands of the nobility, and the monarchy protected by the nobility. But at a certain stage—in France after the great revolution—it also conquered this power and now became in its turn the ruling class in opposition to the proletariat and the small farmer. Observed from this point of view, all historical transactions are very easily explained—with a sufficient knowledge of the contemporaneous economic state of society, unhappily wholly missing in our professional historians; and in a most simple manner the conceptions and ideas of a given historical period are explained by the economic conditions of existence during that period, and by the social and political conditions dependent on those economic factors. History for the first time was placed on its real foundation; the obvious fact hitherto totally neglected, that first of all men must eat, drink, have shelter and clothing, and therefore must work, before they can struggle for supremacy and devote themselves to politics, religion, philosophy, etc.—this obvious fact at last found historical recognition.

Engels' biographic sketch of Marx.

Order THE SOCIALIST STANDARD through your local newsagent. If you have any difficulty in obtaining it regularly please communicate with the S.P.G.B., 22, Gt. James St., London, W.C.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, subscriptions for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, articles, correspondence and advertisements submitted for insertion therein should be addressed.—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 22, Great James Street, London, W.C., to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD is published on the first day in each month.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office every Tuesday at 7 p.m.

Terms of Subscriptions.

UNITED KINGDOM.		
Twelve Months	...	1s. 6d.
Six Months	...	9d.
AMERICA.		
Twelve Months	...	50 cents.
Six Months	...	25 cents.

Scale of Charges for Advertisements.

	£	s.	d.
Per Inch, One Insertion	...	0	2
Quarter Column do.	...	0	5
Half Column do.	...	0	10
One Column do.	...	1	0

Special arrangements will be made for Advertisements to be inserted in more than one issue.

The Socialist Standard,

SUNDAY, SEP. 1, 1907.



Fly Paper Politics.

It is curious that in the song of triumph that was sung by nearly all the "labour" papers on the election of a "Socialist" in the person of Grayson, scarcely a mention was made of the programme upon which the election was run. The *Westminster Gazette*, however, printed the address and was moved to remark in its leading article that Mr. Grayson's "actual proposals, as they appear in his election address are somewhat milder than his theory seems to require." When an orthodox Liberal journal comments thusly, the reason the journals supporting Grayson did not publish his address becomes apparent.

After describing himself as a Socialist, which his programme denies, he puts forward these vote-catching proposals: "The Right to Work," "Forthright, Old Age Pensions, Taxation of Land Values, Free Trade; he says he "would resist any interference with our present Fiscal System;" "Free Maintenance," which may mean anything from soup kitchens to children's barracks; "Abolishing rather than admonishing" the House of Lords, Progressive Income Tax and Temperance Reform. But readers will be interested to learn that his "most immediate and enthusiastic support" is to go "to a measure according women the vote on the same terms as men." Not even adult suffrage! A revolutionary programme indeed. How the Liberals must have trembled to find their opponent stealing their planks and doing their work!

The Fraud of Reform.

A Socialist knows that reforms or measures palliative of capitalism can only be obtained while the master class rules in so far as capitalist interests are thereby served; and since capitalist interests are directly opposed to those of workers in all essential points of wealth and leisure, it is obvious that the measures passed by capitalist representatives will have for object the maintenance or extension of their system or the intensification of the robbery of the workers upon which they depend. It is then a fraud for a candidate to pretend to be able to obtain measures in the workers' interests from the capitalist class in power. The workers can get nothing of their own until they are able to take it. No man is a Socialist who throws out such

fraudulent sops or promises as bait to prospective voters, for besides that it must lead workers to disappointment and apathy and aid their enemies, it is obvious that as far as sops or promises are concerned the master class can, and does when it needs to, always outstep the would-be member. Hence it is of supreme importance that the workers rely upon themselves and concentrate all their energies on the capture of political power for Socialism, for all else is illusion.

A man is not a genius or a Socialist because he calls himself one, and wild appeals to sentiment as in the case of Grayson can never do the work of Science. No election run to further Liberal measures can be a victory for Socialism, for before the workers can emancipate themselves or use in any way the industrial and political machinery to their advantage they must wrest political power from the master class.

I.L.P. Intrigue.

E. R. Hartley of the I.L.P. etc., who actively supported Grayson, lets the cat out of the bag in his account in *Justice* of August 3rd of the Colne Valley victory for confusion. He said that the men of Colne Valley would not have a nominee of the L.R.C. and—

This so displeased the wire-pullers that they used every power they possessed to prevent a candidate being run. It is more than probable if Jarrold had been lost the I.L.P. executive would have refused to give their backing to the Socialist candidate.

One fact stands out for all to see—the I.L.P. run a candidate for Parliament, add their chairman sulk in his tent because he cannot have his own way.

Shades of Democracy! There is not a politician in either the Tory or Liberal Parties who is half such an autocrat as the chairman of the I.L.P. and the secretary of the L.R.C. At the General Election a small group arrogated to itself the right to say where candidates should be run; now it has resolved itself into one man who is going to decide.

When all the backstairs work was done and the winning of Jarrold forced the hand, it was still possible to try and wreck the election, in order to prove how wise and far-seeing was the opposition.

The chairman of the I.L.P. sends no message wishing success to his own party's candidate.

The secretary of the L.R.C. prevents the Labour M.P.'s going to help. Philip Snowden is permitted to go just "to save their face," and the other I.L.P. members of Parliament are conspicuous by their absence.

If the members of the I.L.P. understood the meaning of democracy Mr. Ramsay MacDonald would not be their chairman for another month.

The action of the men who seek to dominate the Socialist movement has received a check, but it is idle for the Socialist movement to shut its eyes to plain facts.

We were all anxious to get some men into Parliament. To anyone who would spend a half-hour in thinking it was quite obvious we could only get our men in with the assistance of one of the great political parties.

Toryism, with its great majority was useless, but the Liberal Party, in its weakness, was only too ready to come to terms.

No arrangements were made, the rank and file would not have stood that; but in a number of constituencies an understanding was arrived at where for a double-membered constituency one Liberal and one Labour man were run, with what Hardie himself described at York as the common object of knocking out the Tories.

When the "understanders" had got their places fixed up, they began a campaign to prevent any further candidates being run.

Nothing succeeds like success, and these tactics were more successful than anybody dreamed they could be. The very success, however, brought further complications; the I.L.P. contributions to the funds are less than £100 and their members' salaries £1,400. While the trade unions are bound to admit their members won their seats mainly through the propaganda of the Socialists, it must be admitted their contributions to the maintenance of the I.L.P. members is on a liberal scale.

Perhaps it will now be obvious why the L.R.C. would not endorse another Socialist candidature and why it is very unlikely they will endorse any in the near future.

The above admissions should be noted, for when we point out similar things we are said to be abusive. But the truth of them cannot be disputed and they are eloquent of the condition of things within the "Independent" Labour Party.

The second contribution of the Advocates of Industrial Unionism is not to hand at the moment of going to press.

PARTY NOTES.

The second edition of our Manifesto is selling splendidly.

Our speakers are often asked: What is the attitude of the S.P.G.B. to the S.D.F.? to the I.L.P.? to the Labour Party? to the S.L.P.? All these parties are dealt with in our Manifesto. If you have not yet had it send 1½d. to Head Office for a copy.

A further edition of "From Handicraft to Capitalism" is now on sale (post free, 1½d.) It should be recollected that the S.P.G.B. alone have been authorised to translate into English "Das Erfurter Program," by Karl Kautsky, of which "From Handicraft to Capitalism" forms the first part.

The second part, "The Proletariat," will be issued as a penny pamphlet very shortly.

A new pamphlet will also be issued in the course of a few weeks, viz., "Art, Labour, and Socialism," by Wm. Morris, price 1d., post free, 1½d.

Mr. Geo. W. Daw, Conservative Agent for Wandsworth Division, has accepted a challenge to debate with a member of our Tooting Branch. He afterwards received a challenge from the Tooting Branch of the I.L.P. In the course of his reply to them he said: "Before giving your invitation final consideration I should like to know something more definite about the Socialism of the I.L.P. I think I am justified in making this request, because it is definitely stated in the Manifesto of the S.P.G.B., a body which should be competent to form an accurate opinion on the subject, that 'the I.L.P. is in reality run by a set of job hunters, whose only apparent political principle is to catch votes on varying pretexts and by still more varying means.' . . . If, however, your branch is really anxious for a debate, why not accept the repeated challenge of Mr. Barker on behalf of the S.P.G.B. to prove your claim to be a Socialist Party?"

The answer of the local branch of the I.L.P. will be interesting, if not instructive. Perhaps amusing also.

Our comrade Marsh, of Manchester, informs us that he recently attended an I.L.P. lecture by a Mr. Yardly, who claimed to be a Socialist, and told the audience that Christ was his typical Socialist. He advocated Co-operation, a living wage, and the municipalisation of everything. Our comrade asked a question, but the chairman immediately told the lecturer whom he was, and the lecturer said: "I want no bloody revolution, only evolution! Our comrade asked him to explain the difference to the meeting, he replied: "You are only fencing." He was then challenged to debate, but the chairman arose and said they could not accept questions from our comrade!

Is it a fact that in consequence of the references thereto in the Manifesto of the S.P.G.B., the N.E.C. of the I.L.P. are seriously thinking of publishing the names of the anonymous persons who presented the Party with a cheque for £1,000 last January?

An advertisement of the tour of Comrades Dawkins and Kent thro' the Midlands was sent to *Justice*. Mr. Quelch returned it and the remittance, declining to insert. Is he afraid that if the rank and file of the S.D.F. became aware of the truth concerning the leaders of the S.D.F. and of the T.C.P., his occupation, like Othello's, would be gone?

K.

Exact justice is commonly more merciful in the long run than pity, for it tends to foster in men those stronger qualities which make them good citizens.—*Lowell*.

SOCIALISM AND WAR.

TWO QUESTIONS AND AN OBJECTION.

ONE cannot help wishing that more of those who have doubts and difficulties in their understanding of Socialism took the trouble to send them along.

The difficulties and objections of the working class regarding their party's position are precisely what we are labouring to meet, and queries sent to us serve not only to indicate the nature of the difficulties to be met but also tend to show by their discussion the hollowness of objections which too many take for granted.

A subscriber in the Potteries, J. T. Tyson, sends two questions and an objection which, since they deal with matters of general interest and provide an opportunity for making plain the Socialist position, we gladly answer here.

Converting the Capitalist.

Regarding the following quotation from this paper: "Members of the capitalist class are only Socialists to the extent that they vacate their class position and go over to the working class," our correspondent asks:—

Does this mean that a member of the bourgeoisie must give away his wealth and allow the rest of the theiving gang to exploit the philanthropy of that individual?

By no means. The capitalist would as suggested not do the workers or their cause the slightest good by giving his wealth away in that manner. In present-day society there is for the capitalist only the choice of exploiting or being exploited, and one who vacates his position in that sense simply steps aside to allow a wider field of exploitation to less scrupulous competitors. To expect to lessen exploitation by the withdrawal of a capitalist here and there is like believing that when a bucket of water is lifted out of the sea a hole will remain unfilled by the surrounding ocean.

The capitalist who becomes converted can only use his wealth, power and leisure on the workers' behalf by helping to end the system of exploitation, and in doing this he "must vacate his class position," that is to say, take his stand on the side of the class that lives by labour, making its interests his own, and giving battle to his former class which will defend to the last its ability to fatten upon the labour of others.

There is, however, little need to worry over the line of action of the genuine converted capitalist. He is a *rara avis*. No class has yet ruled in the interests of a class below it and our masters are not going to break the rule of history. Our propagandist efforts can only be really fruitful by being applied to the working class whose material interests are on our side; and any isolated individuals from the other side who are converted will, from the very fact of their conversion, know what course of action must be pursued.

Socialism and War.

The next question is:—

How do you propose to abolish war?

To know how war is to end it is necessary to know how wars begin.

Formerly wars were dynastic in origin; but to-day, owing to the expansion of capitalist production outstripping the effective demand of the home market and necessitating "fields fresh and pastures new" for the disposal of the ever-growing surplus of commodities, we find that all modern wars are commercial in origin and in aim.

Thus the foreign and colonial markets are indispensable to capitalism, and form a safety valve which is, indeed, now fast becoming choked up.

And in getting such colonies, "spheres of influence," "open ports," protectorates and treaties required for this external trade, each nation finds itself at the throat of other capitalist nations, and war is only averted so long as each is afraid of the other.

Russia in seeking ports open to the sea at all seasons and Japan in resisting Russia's encroachments upon her markets; Britain in seeking markets and a "scientific frontier" in North

West India against Russian advance; the United States in securing rich fields of exploitation in Cuba and the Philippines; all indicate the commercial basis of modern war which has literally developed from the continued fighting of the chartered trading companies of rival nations in the four quarters of the globe during earlier times.

So long as a corrupt Press and a powerful section of manufacturers of war stores and munitions have everything to gain by war; so long as rival capitalist nations strive against each other for the plunder of the world; so long as increasing productive powers render imperative new outlets for the growing surplus of commodities; so long, indeed, as there exists a wage-slave class to be held in subjection—in short, so long as Capitalism endures—for just so long will war or the armed threat of war be inevitable and the desire for peace a vain aspiration.

They who concentrate upon Socialism alone are the truest workers for peace, for the abolition of capitalist exploitation is the indispensable prelude to international peace and human solidarity. With international Socialism the struggle of exploiters for plunder is ended, since it is the many who labour who rule, and their paramount interest lies not in destructive contention for plunder but in the co-operation of all for the better utilisation of nature's forces; and compared with this supreme interest of international labour, every petty conflicting interest must pale into utter insignificance.

In the co-operative commonwealth the necessity of forcing commodities into countries at the cannon's mouth no more exists. The workers of the world have everything to gain when triumphant by peaceful co-operation, and everything to lose by war.

Our correspondent will now gather how alone the principal causes of war can be abolished; it is by destroying the political and economic supremacy of the exploiting class through the organisation and training of the industrial-political army of the workers to that end.

Peace is only possible when the conditions of peace are present; to-day conditions all round spell bitter strife which can only end by the defeat of the master class in the great class struggle.

It is, therefore, no part of our duty to aid the ruling class to obtain an improved fighting force or "armed nation" which the class which now rules must perforce control and use to our greater oppression and undoing. Such a proceeding may well be left to capitalists—to Earl Roberts and to the reformers. It is our business to end capitalism, not to forge weapons for our enemies use. When the workers have something other than wage-slavery to defend they will take steps to defend it, for the present all their energy is needed in concentrating upon the conquest of the machinery of government, (which includes the armed forces), in order to convert this "from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic."

Do THE WORKERS pay for Wars?

Referring to the question of taxation to pay for wars, the objection which our correspondent raises runs as follows:—

It must be admitted that the capitalists do not pay for wars, the wealth has to be got out of the workers, and seeing that the Boer war cost about £240,000,000 it is not likely that this will come out of the capitalists, and to say that they cannot get more than all is in this case wrong. For instance, the English worker gets one-third of the value he creates while the American gets but one-fifth, so that if speeding up became the rule in order to get the equivalent of the cost of the war the worker would be worse off. If I have wrongly understood the situation I hope you will put me right.

Let us then endeavour to put our friend right.

In the first place, all marketable wealth is created by those whose labour is manually and mentally expended in its production, therefore all the cost of war and everything else comes ultimately from those who produce. So far there is agreement. But to imply from this that the producers actually pay for all, is to say that they possess the wealth their labour has created, and that their banking accounts would have benefited by the £240,000,000 if that amount had not been spent on the war! It is, however, notoriously not the case that the workers possess the wealth they create, for the wealth as soon as

produced is already the property of the master class; the workers, indeed, only receiving the market price of their labour-power—that is, a bare sufficiency for the reproduction and maintenance of that labour-power, and which leaves no surplus with which to pay for wars.

The master class is always engaged in screwing wages down to the lowest profitable limit under the conditions prevailing, and this whether a war has occurred or not. A war in fact does not even usually act detrimentally to the modern workers—at least as far as wages are concerned—since during war and often as an after consequence of war there is actually a larger demand for labour-power, both for the supply of munitions of war and afterwards to replace the property destroyed and to produce for the extended market. The great prosperity of France and Germany after the Franco-German war is a case in point. The condition of the labour market is the immediate governing factor of the price and conditions of labour-power, and if the market is not turned by the war against the wage-worker, how is it possible for the master class to get extra out of the workers for that war?

The fact that the English worker gets on an average one-third of his product while the American, in spite of higher wages, gets only one-fifth, does not prove that the masters can at will or for any length of time get another two-fifths of the English worker's product by taxation. Indeed, if the taxation could be so manipulated that it really reduced the average wages it would have the effect of causing serious loss to the masters by lowering the efficiency of their available labour supply; thus they would tend to get even less out of the workers than before. Friend Tyson's own illustration goes to prove this.

The American worker gets higher wages and his product is proportionally greater because his high wages are the price of a more efficient and speedy labour-power. The lower the standard of subsistence of the workers the lower is the average efficiency of their labour, therefore to reduce wages by any means (other things remaining equal) is to reduce the efficiency of that kind of labour-power.

The researches of C. Booth, Rowntree and Robert Hunter show that the working class under the most diverse conditions gets barely sufficient to maintain and reproduce the respective grades of labour-power; and while the advance of capital steadily increases the robbery of the working man, so also the fact must remain that "high" wages usually mean high profits only because a more intense and more profitable labour-power costs more to produce than a lower grade, and because low wages mean inefficient labour.

To get as much out of the worker here as in America is therefore impossible by means of taxation whether for a war or even a peace conference. To increase the proportion of surplus value to wages here to the same degree as in America can only be done by improvements in the methods of production and in increasing the efficiency of the human machines by feeding, sheltering and training them better. This again depends on economic and social causes for its practicability.

While the bigger capitalists generally recognise that starvation wages do not conduce to efficiency or to high profits in the long run, yet since the efficiency of the workers is due to historical and social rather than to individual or temporary causes, the average capitalist will endeavour to force wages down to the lowest physical limits unless he can in some degree as at Port Sunlight, Bourneville and other places segregate and improve a supply of labour-power for his sole use. If the capitalist cannot ensure that he individually will reap all the benefit of the higher efficiency that is induced, he is not going to embark in "philanthropy" to benefit his competitors. The larger capitalists, indeed, are not generally averse to legislative enactment which aims at increasing the general profit-making capacity of workers, or indeed to old style trade union "collective bargaining" for similar reasons. Such legislation and collective bargaining operates also as a means of crippling the competition of the smaller capitalist, the middle-class manufacturer, baker and the like, who, in his futile struggle against the advance of great capital, strives by sweating and by the

payment of wages insufficient to reproduce efficiency to make profit parasitically by the depreciation and degradation of the normal labour-power, relying for renewals upon the necessities of fresh normal workers.

Thus the amount to be wrung out of the workers by the master class is limited by the degree of economic development and by the prevailing state of Society. It is consequently difficult to conceive how the master class in order to pay for wars is to get more from the workers than it otherwise gets, since the capitalists rob the workers to the utmost of their power under any conditions.

The conclusion, indeed, is clear that the workers do not pay for wars since they do not possess the millions required as means of payment. The toilers are skinned before they leave the factory gates, and to rob them further is very like trying to take the trousers off a Highlander.

The ruling class takes all that remains over the bare average keep of the wage workers and is, therefore, already squeezing all that it can out of the working class. The payment for war comes in consequence not from wages but from profits, for the class that lives by the daily robbery of the workers is no more a magician than is the common cutpurse and like him it "cannot take more than all."

W.

UNCONSIDERED TRIFLES.

BEING LETTERS NOT HITHERTO PUBLISHED.

To the Editor of the *Daily News*.

Sir,—I observe in your issue of date that Mr. D. A. Thomas, M.P., has been threatening that unless the Government is prepared to bring in forthwith a radical measure of temperance reform, he will seriously consider the advisability of going over to the "Labour, Independent Labour, or Socialist Party."

This I think is most kind and considerate of Mr. Thomas and I make no doubt that the "Labour and Independent Labour Party," which is always on the look-out for persons of political or social standing, will be happy for the chance of welcoming the Welsh gentleman to its councils and adding his political scalp to the tent pole of its wig-wam. Particularly as he is in favor of a "radical measure of temperance reform," which so far as I have noticed, represents the "Labour and Independent Labour Party's" most revolutionary proposal. I cannot speak for that Party, but I can speak for the Socialist Party of Great Britain—the only real Labour Party of my knowledge—and on its behalf I must inform Mr. Thomas, M.P., that we cannot do with him.

Mr. Thomas would, I am sure, prefer to have it pointed out quite frankly that we have no use for M.P.'s whose political development has only reached the stage in which such grotesquely unimportant matters as temperance reform occupy pre-eminent positions. The Socialist Party has to deal with great working-class issues and until Mr. Thomas has given some evidence of his appreciation of those issues I am afraid it will be useless for him to apply for membership. Our measure of the fitness of a man to voice Labour's claims is neither membership of a Westminster political club nor a standing in "Society," but the indications he gives of a clear knowledge of the working-class position, its causes and its only remedy, and of his determination to proceed to that remedy along the only lines that can logically be followed by any person claiming to be a Socialist, viz. the lines of relentless hostility toward all other parties of whatever political label.

This may sound strangely to Mr. Thomas but then clearly Mr. Thomas doesn't understand. The Socialist can only justify his separate organisation upon the ground of the futility of all the other bodies claiming working-class support. Not being able consistently or honestly to support futilities or to stand by passively while his own object is obscured and his work frustrated, he must actively oppose. If he does not he is useless as a Socialist—worse than useless indeed. That is our complaint against all other political parties. If they are representing capitalist

interests as is indisputably the case with the orthodox Liberal and Tory, they cannot represent working-class interests which are always and in every essential particular, in antagonism to capitalists' interests,—witness Belfast where, by the way, Liberal sympathy with the workers in revolt under oppressive conditions, is manifesting itself in the same old way: through soldiery and quick-firing guns even as at Featherstone and Hull. If they are claiming to specially represent working-class interests (as in the case of the "Labour" Party falsely so called), they must establish their claim by giving evidence of their understanding of the working-class position and directly pointing their efforts to the overthrow of the prevailing (capitalist) method of production based upon the exploitation (robbery) of Labour. This evidence is entirely lacking and the conclusion is forced upon us that the "Labour" Party is either composed of ignorant persons, or those who have deliberately bartered their Socialist principles for the wages which the Party pays. If they are definitely asserting their Socialism as is the case (at times) with the Social-Democratic Federation, they are also, by supporting capitalist candidates, by arrangement with capitalist parties and by the propaganda of inconsequentialities sometimes called palliatives, nullifying any good effect of their occasional assertion of Socialism as admittedly the only hope of the workers, obscuring the class issue, confusing the working-class mind and, therefore, as Socialism is inconceivable apart from a class-conscious working class, delaying the day of Labour's emancipation.

For these reasons we are opposed to them all. For these reasons we claim to stand as the only party of the workers—the only Socialist Party in this island. And for these reasons we cannot at this stage of his development accept any application for membership from Mr. Thomas. It will save the gentleman some humiliation if he will try and understand this at once.

Yours etc.,
AGRA.

30.7.07.

THE MENACE OF SOCIALISM.

To the Editor of the *Daily Express*.

Sir,—I pray you be gentle. As you value truth—and how much you value truth the world knows well—be merciful. Say what you will; do anything that seemeth you fit, but spare us who are Socialists the dire infliction of the public association with our movement of the names of such gentlemen as the vice presidents of the Land Nationalisation Society or similar organisations—names like Thomasson, Cornwall, Macnamara, Bell, Vivian, and unkindest cut of all, Burns! Scourge us not with whips like these. Have pity! We do not deserve it—really!

And, oh! Sir, tell the trenchant, virile, truth-telling and painstaking author of your articles under this head, to take it from me that there is nothing subterranean about our propaganda. We are loudly, openly, and unblushingly preachers of discontent, organisers of working-class revolt, propagandists of a fierce, unrelenting war upon Capitalism and all its works and all its champions and must remain so while we remain Socialists, until the working class, with whose well-being we are solely concerned, shall have taken control of the political machinery and through that the whole of the land and other means of life, in their own interests. And we include among the works and champions of Capitalism all shufflers and intriguers, all misleaders whether styling themselves Labour men or otherwise, or whether merely fools or arrant knaves; Liberals and Tories to a man, Constitutionalists and Tariff or Municipal Reformers so called, literary pimps and panders, journals with the largest circulations, and so on. All who do not accept Socialism as the only hope of the workers, all who are not with us, are against the working class.

Of course we who are Socialists cannot help people taking our name in vain and working in dark ways for the realisation of their ends any more than you could help the good name of your paper (if it had one) being besmirched. But if these people think, as some of them, I believe, quite honestly do, to achieve Socialism by back-stair methods, they must be deplorably stupid people; and deplorably stupid people

cannot be Socialists—any more than jingo editors can be honest. If they are not stupid they may be and probably are as you describe them, "political fakes working craftily in the dark" but they will be working for their own aggrandisement.

But that's not our fault. Not every one who cryeth "Lord! Lord!" shall enter the Kingdom of Heaven; and not every one who sayeth (on occasions) that he is a Socialist will come through an examination creditably. In short, we are not all Socialists now, notwithstanding a certain fat and be-knighted person's notorious asseveration to the contrary. We repudiate these men of craft and do our best to let in the light upon the stupid; and we are continually exposing the working-class misleader. The young person with a passion for righteousness who spreads himself on your front page every morning, should read *THE SOCIALIST STANDARD*, the organ of The Socialist Party of Great Britain. He would then be able to get a notion of what Socialism means, the only way it can be realised and the only position a Socialist party can take up. And he would learn that the *Express* is not a Socialist paper because it is presumably in favour of the nationalisation of the postal service; nor are Belgium and Germany Socialist countries because they have nationalised railways; nor is Japan Socialist because she has a form of land nationalisation. And then he may discover to his (probable) surprise that a man may even be a "Constitutionalist," an anti-Socialist, and a member of the "Socialist" Land Nationalisation Society! I say probable because I have some reason to know that the writer is quite as well aware as I am that he is writing "piffle."

However, I note with more than ordinary interest that you include in your latest list of "Spies and 'plants' and political fakes who work craftily in the dark and fight under any colour but their own" the name of your erstwhile particular political pet, your own level-headed labour-leader, your strong anti-Socialist fighter, Richard Bell, M.P., who, I conclude from your remarks, is really working insidiously for Socialism in the "Socialist" Land Nationalisation Society! I hope poor Richard will be properly grateful.

Finally, Sir, I don't suppose for a moment that you will publish all this. What you will do (if you publish anything at all) will of course be to select those sentences which you think may in themselves look rather atrocious and arrange them in an order that will either seem to reflect upon the writer or support your contention. That of course is the pretty way usually affected by the Northcliffe-Pearson combination. But as I have taken the precaution of keeping a copy which I expect will appear in *THE SOCIALIST STANDARD*, it won't greatly matter what you do.

Believe me, Sir,
Yours appreciatively,
AGRA.

24.7.07.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

- L. J. SIMONS (Stoke Newington).—No room in this issue. Letter will appear in next.
V. WILSON (Manchester).—Next month.
F. D. (London, N.W.).—We had seen the S.D.F. definition of "Impossibilists" in *Justice* and were much amused thereat. We also recognise "that tactics are necessarily determined by circumstances," but we include as chief item among these circumstances the object to be attained. We also know that policy is not synonymous with principle, but we, however, believe that policy should be consistent with principle. We know of none who hold that "if we cannot find a perfectly straight road to a place we ought not to go there!" But we do not at all believe in going the longest and most treacherous road or indeed going toward an entirely different and undesirable goal in order that the interests of leaders and place hunters may thereby be served. Nor indeed do we believe in using "any available means" but only those means which lead in the quickest and surest way to Socialism irrespective of capitalist blandishments, leaders' interests or legal forms. We are, then, not "Impossibilists" if *Justice's* definition be correct, but we doubt its correctness for we have usually seen what is described as "Impossibilism" associated with Socialist science, working-class sincerity and correct tactics.

A further instalment of Kautsky's "Proletariat" is unavoidably held over.

ART, LABOUR, AND SOCIALISM.

By W. M. MORRIS.

Reprinted from "To-day."

SOMETHING must be wrong then in art, or the happiness of life is sickening in the house of civilisation. What has caused the sickness? Machine labour will you say? Well, I have seen quoted a passage from one of the ancient Sicilian poets rejoicing in the fashioning of a water-mill, and exulting in labour being set free from the toil of the hand-loom in consequence; and that surely would be a type of a man's natural hope when foreseeing the invention of labour-saving machinery as it called; natural surely, since though I have said that the labour of which art could form a part should be accompanied by pleasure, no one could deny that there is some necessary labour even which is not pleasant in itself, and plenty of unnecessary labour which is merely painful. If machinery had been used for minimising such labour, the utmost ingenuity would scarcely have been wasted on it, but is that the case in any way? Look round the world, and you must agree with J. S. Mill in his doubt whether all the machinery of modern times has lightened the daily work of one labourer.

And why have our natural hopes been so disappointed? Surely because in these latter days, in which as a matter of fact machinery has been invented, it was by no means invented with the aim of saving the pain of labour. The phrase labour-saving machinery is elliptical, and means machinery which saves the cost of labour, not the labour itself, which will be expended when 'saved' on tending other machines. For a doctrine which, as I have said, began to be accepted under the workshop system, is now universally received even though we are yet short of the complete development of the system of the Factory. Briefly, the doctrine is this, that the essential aim of manufacture is making a profit; that it is frivolous to consider whether the wares when made will be of more or less use to the world so long as anyone can be found to buy them at a price which, when the workman engaged in making them has received of necessities and comforts as little as he can be got to take, will leave something over as a reward to the capitalist who has employed him. This doctrine of the sole aim of manufacture (or indeed of life) being the profit of the capitalist and the occupation of the workman, is held, I say by almost everyone; its corollary is, that labour is necessarily unlimited, and that to attempt to limit it is not so much foolish as wicked, whatever misery may be caused to the community by the manufacture and sale of the wares made.

It is this superstition of commerce being an end in itself, of man made for commerce, not commerce for man, of which art has sickened; not of the accidental appliances which that superstition when put in practice has brought to its aid; machines and railways and the like, which do now verily control us all, might have been controlled by us, if we had not been resolute to seek 'profit and occupation' at the cost of establishing for a time that corrupt and degrading anarchy which has usurped the name of Society.

It is my business to foster your discontent with that anarchy and its visible results; for indeed I think it would be an insult to you to suppose that you are contented with the state of things as they are; contented to see all beauty vanish from our beautiful city for instance; contented with the squalor of the black country, with the hideousness of London, the wen of all wens, as Cobbet called it; contented with the ugliness and baseness which everywhere surrounds the life of civilised man; contented, lastly, to be living above that unutterable and sickening misery of which a few details are once again reaching us, as if from some distant unhappy country, of which we could scarcely expect to hear, but which I tell you is the necessary foundation on which our society, our anarchy rests.

* * * * *

Now above all things I want us not to console

ourselves by averages for the fact that the riches of the rich and the comfort of the well-to-do are founded on that terrible mass of undignified, unrewarded, *useless* misery, concerning which we have of late been hearing a little, a very little; after all we do know that is a fact and we can only console ourselves by hoping that we may, if we are watchful and diligent (which we very seldom are) we may greatly diminish the amount of it. I ask you is such a hope as that worthy of our boasted civilisation with its perfected creeds, its high morality, its sounding political maxims? Will you think it monstrous that some people have conceived another hope, and see before them the ideal of a society in which there should be no classes permanently degraded for the benefit of the Commonwealth?

For one thing I would have you remember, that this lowest class of utter poverty lies like a gulf before the whole of the working class, who in spite of all averages live a precarious life; the failure in the game of life which entails on a rich man an unambitious retirement, and on a well-to-do man a life of dependence and laborious shifts, drags a working man down into that hell of irredeemable degradation.

I hope there are but few at least here who can comfort their consciences by saying that the working class bring this degradation on themselves by their own thrift and recklessness. Some do no doubt; stoic philosophers of the higher type not being much commoner among day labourers than among the well-to-do and rich; but we know very well how sorely the mass of the poor strive, practising such thrift as is in itself a degradation to man, in whose very nature it is to love mirth and pleasure, and how in spite of all that they fall into the gulf. What! are we going to deny that when we see all round us in our own class cases of men failing in life by no fault of their own? nay many of the failures worthier and more useful than those that succeed: as might indeed be looked for in the state of war, which we call the system of unlimited competition, where the best campaigning luggage a man can carry is a hard heart and no scruples.

For indeed the fulfilment of that liberal ideal of the reform of our present system into a state of moderate class supremacy is impossible because that system is after all nothing but a continuous implacable war; the war once ended and commerce, as we now understand the word, comes to an end, and the mountains of wares which are either useless in themselves or only useful to slaves and slave-owners are no longer made, and once again art will be used to determine what things are useful and what useless to be made; since nothing should be made which does not give pleasure to the maker and the user, and that pleasure of making *must* produce art in the hands of the workman; so will art be used to discriminate between the waste and the usefulness of labour; whereas at present the waste of labour is, as I have said above, a matter never considered at all; so long as a man toils he is supposed to be useful, no matter what he toils at.

I tell you the very essence of competitive commerce is waste; the waste that comes of the anarchy of war. Do not be deceived by the outside appearance of order in our plutocratic society. It fares with it as it does with the older forms of war, that there is an outside look of quite wonderful order about it; how neat and comforting the steady march of the regiment; how quiet and respectable the sergeants' look; how clean the polished cannon; neat as a new pin are the storehouses of murder; the books of adjutant and sergeant as innocent looking as may be; nay, the very orders for destruction and plunder are given with a quiet precision which seems the very token of a good conscience; this is the mask that lies before the ruined cornfield and the burning cottage, the mangled bodies, the untimely death of worthy men, the desolate home. All this, the results of the order and sobriety which is the face which civilised soldiering turns towards us stay-at-homes, we have been told often and eloquently enough to consider; often enough we have been shown the wrong side of the glories of war, nor can we be shown it too often or too eloquently; yet, I say, even such a mask is worn by competitive commerce, with its respectable, prim order, its talk of peace and the

blessings of intercommunication of countries and the like; and all the while its whole energy, its whole organised precision is employed in one thing, the wrenching the means of living from others; while outside that everything must do as it may, whoever is the worse or the better for it; like the war of fire and steel, all other aims must be crushed out before that one object; worse than the older war in one respect at least, that whereas that war was intermittent, this is continuous and unrelenting, and its leaders and captains are never tired of declaring that it must last as long as the world, and is the end all and be all of the creation of man and of his home; of such the words are said:—

For them alone do seethe
A thousand men in troubles wide and dark;
Half ignorant they turn an easy wheel
That sets sharp racks at work to pinch and peel.

What can overthrow this terrible organisation so strong in itself, so rooted in the self-interest, stupidity, and cowardice of strenuous, narrow-minded men? So strong in itself and so much fortified against attack by the surrounding anarchy which it has bred?

Nothing, but discontent with that anarchy and an order which in its turn will arise from it, nay, is arising from it, an order once a part of the internal organisation of that which it is doomed to destroy.

For the fuller development of industrialism from the ancient crafts through the workshop system into the system of the factory and machine, while it has taken from the workmen all pleasure in their labour or hope of distinction or excellence in it, has welded them into a great class, and has by its very oppression and compulsion of the monotony of life driven them into feeling the solidarity of their interests and the antagonism of those interests to those of the capitalist class: they are all through civilisation feeling the necessity of their rising as a class. As I have said, it is impossible for them to coalesce with the middle class to produce the universal reign of moderate *bourgeois* society which some have dreamed of; because however many of them rise out of their class, these become at once part of the middle class, owners of capital, even though it be in a small way, and exploiters of labour; and there is still left behind a lower class which in its own turn drags down to it the unsuccessful in the struggle; a process which is being accelerated in these latter days by the rapid growth of the great factories and stores which are extinguishing the remains of the small workshops served by men who may hope to become small masters, and also the smaller of the tradesmen class; thus then, feeling that it is impossible for them to rise as a class while competition, naturally, and as a necessity for its existence, keeps them down, they have begun to look to *association* as their natural tendency, just as competition is of the capitalists; in them the hope has arisen, if nowhere else, of finally making an end of class degradation.

I know there are some to whom this possibility of the getting rid of class degradation may come, not as a hope, but as a fear; these may comfort themselves by thinking that this Socialist matter is a hollow scare, in England at least; that the proletariat have no hope, and therefore will lie quiet in this country, where the rapid and nearly complete development of commercialism has crushed the power of combination out of the lower classes; where the very combinations, the Trades Unions, founded for the advancement of the working class as a class, have already become conservative and obstructive bodies, wielded by the middle-class politicians for party purposes; where the proportion of the town and manufacturing districts to the country is so great that the inhabitants, no longer recruited by the peasantry, but become townsmen bred of townsmen, are yearly deteriorating in physique; where lastly education is so backward.

It may be that in England the mass of the working class has no hope; that it will not be hard to keep them down for a while—possibly a long while. The hope that this may be so I will say plainly is a dastard's hope, for it is founded on the chance of their degradation. I say such an expectation is that of slave-holders or the hangers-on of slave-holders. I believe, however, that hope is growing among the working class even in England; at any rate you may be sure of one thing, that there is at least dis-

content. Can any of us doubt that, since there is unjust suffering, or which of us would be contented with 10s. a week to keep our households with, or to dwell in unutterable filth and have to pay the price of good lodging for it? Do you doubt that, if we had any time for it amidst our struggle to live, we should look into the title of those who kept us there, themselves rich and comfortable under the pretext that it was necessary to society?

Remember we have but one weapon against that terrible organisation of selfishness which we attack, and that weapon is Union. Yes, and it should be obvious union which we can be conscious of, as we mix with others who are hostile or indifferent to the cause; organised brotherhood is that which must break the spell of anarchical plutocracy. One man with an idea in his head is in danger of being considered a madman; two men with the same idea in common may be foolish, but can hardly be mad; ten men sharing an idea begin to act; a hundred draw attention as fanatics, a thousand and society begins to tremble, a hundred thousand and there is war abroad, and the cause has victories tangible and real—and why only a hundred thousand? Why not a hundred million and peace upon earth? You and me who agree together, it is we who have to answer that question.

BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, &c. to be obtained of the S.P.G.B., 22, Great James St., London, E.C.

CAPITAL (Karl Marx) ... 5s. 6d.
WORK AND WAGES (Thorold Rogers) ... 5s. 6d.
POVERTY (Rowntree) ... 4s. 6d.
SOCIALIST STANDARD
Vols. I, II, & III, (Bound) each 3s. 0d.
3 Vols., bound in one ... 5s. 6d.
MANIFESTO OF THE S.P.G.B. ... 1½d.
RULES OF THE S.P.G.B. ... 2½d.
S.P.G.B. EMBLEM ... 3d.
FROM HANDICRAFT TO CAPITALISM (Kautsky) 1½d.
ALL POST FREE.

MANIFESTO

OF THE

Socialist Party of Great Britain.

Second Edition, with preface, now ready.

Explains the Party's position towards the S.D.F., I.L.P., Fabian Society, Trade Unions, S.L.P., etc.

Price - One Penny.

Post free 1½d. per copy from the S.P.G.B., 22, Great James Street, London, W.C.
The Trade supplied by Henderson, 16, Paternoster Row, London, E.C.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

HEAD OFFICE:

22, GREAT JAMES STREET, LONDON, W.C.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—A. Jones, Secretary, 3, Mathew St., Latchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at S.P.G.B., Laburnam House, 134, High Street, Battersea, S.W. Club open every evening.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Executive Committee. Applications should be sent to the General Secretary.

EAST HAM.—W. Gifford, Sec., 31, Maryland Square, Stratford. Branch meets Mondays at 7.30 at 447, Katherine Rd., Forest Gate.

EDMONTON.—Sidney Auty, Sec. 60, Gilpin Grove, Edmonton. Branch meets Wednesdays 8.30.

FULHAM.—E. Waller, Secretary, 45, Warple Way, Wandsworth, S.W. Branch meets June 3 and alternate Mondays at 8 at Ingram's Coffee Tavern, Fulham Cross.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Fri. at 8.30 at 79, Grove Rd., Holloway. Communications to the Sec.

PADDINGTON.—Communications to J. H. Halls, 66, Fifth Av., Queen's Park, W. Branch meets every Wednesday, 8.30 p.m., at Harley's Coffee Tavern (foot of Lock Bridge), Harrow Rd.

PECKHAM.—W. Wren, Sec., 91, Evelina Rd., Nunhead, S.E. Branch meets every Wed. at 8.30

ROMFORD DIVISION.—All communications to the Secretary, S.P.G.B. Club, 39, York Road, Ilford. Branch meets Mondays at 8 at Club.

TOOTING.—P. Dumenil, Secretary, 36, Byton Road, Tooting, S.W. Branch meets every Wed. at 8 p.m. at Goringe Dining Rooms, Goringe Park Parade, Tooting Junction.

TOTTENHAM.—T. Lobb, Sec. Branch meets Mon. 8 at p.m., at Sunbeam Coffee Tavern, High Rd.

WATFORD.—T. Wilkins, Sec., 4, Marlborough Rd., Branch meets alternate Fridays at 8 p.m.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Mondays 7.30, followed at 8.30 by discussion, at 447, Katherine Road, Forest Gate.

WOOD GREEN.—H. Crump, Secretary, 39, Hermitage Road, Harringay, N. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Mondays at 8.30 at 2, Station Road, Wood Green.

WOOLWICH & PLUMSTEAD.—A. E. Rance, Sec., 44, Brookdene Rd., Plumstead. Branch meets on 2nd and 4th Wednesdays in month at 80, Conway Road, Plumstead.

INFORMATION

concerning the Party can be obtained of the following
BRADFORD (Yorks).—Ben Wilde, 78, Godwin St.
LIVERPOOL.—J. M. O. Sullivan, 4, Laburnam Grove, Litherland.
MANCHESTER.—J. Marsh, 97, Blantyre Street, Swinton, Nr. Manchester.

TO NEWSAGENTS.

"The Socialist Standard" and all other publications of The Socialist Party of Great Britain are supplied to the trade by Henderson's, 16, Paternoster Row, London, E.C.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

HOLDS

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master-class, and the consequent enslavement of the working-class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working-class from the domination of the master-class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working-class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist-class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working-class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working-class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master-class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

APPLICATION FOR MEMBERSHIP.

To the Secretary,

.....Branch, S.P.G.B.

I hereby declare my adhesion to the above principles, and request enrolment as a member of The Socialist Party of Great Britain.

Signature.....

Address.....

Date.....

S.P.G.B. LECTURE LIST. SEPT., 1907.

SUNDAYS.	8th.	15th.	22nd.	29th.
Battersea, Prince's Head	11.30 J. Fitzgerald	H. Newman	T. A. Jackson	J. McManus
"	7.30 T. A. Jackson	J. McManus	H. Newman	T. A. Jackson
Clapham Common	3.30 J. Fitzgerald	E. Fairbrother	T. A. Jackson	H. Newman
Finsbury Park	3.30 A. Anderson	J. Fitzgerald	J. Crump	F. C. Watts
Fulham, op. site Salisbury Hotel	7.30 E. Fairbrother	T. W. Allen	F. C. Watts	J. Fitzgerald
Ilford, Ruden Street	8.0 R. H. Kent	A. Anderson	J. Kent	W. A. Cole
Jolly Butchers' Hill	11.30 J. Crump	R. H. Kent	J. Fitzgerald	R. H. Kent
Manor Park Broadway	11.30 J. Kent	F. E. Dawkins	W. A. Cole	J. Kent
Paddington, Prince of Wales	11.30 F. C. Watts	F. C. Watts	W. Gifford	J. Fitzgerald
Plaistow, op. site Abbey Arms	11.30 F. E. Dawkins	J. Kent	A. J. Keeler	J. H. Kennett
Tooting Broadway	7.30 J. McManus	T. A. Jackson	J. Fitzgerald	J. Kent
Tottenham, West Green Cnr.	11.30 A. Anderson	A. Anderson	T. W. Allen	A. Anderson
"	7.30 H. Newman	J. Fitzgerald	A. Anderson	A. Anderson
MONDAYS.	9th.	16th.	23rd.	30th.
Ilford, Ruden St.	8.30 J. Kent	F. E. Dawkins	W. A. Cole	H. C. Phillips
WEDNESDAYS.	4th.	11th.	18th.	25th.
Highbury Corner	8.30 J. Fitzgerald	T. A. Jackson	J. Fitzgerald	F. E. Dawkins
Waltham Green Broadway	8.30 E. Fairbrother	H. Newman	T. A. Jackson	T. W. Allen
THURSDAYS.	5th.	12th.	19th.	26th.
North Kensington, corner of	8.30 T. W. Allen	F. C. Watts	T. W. Allen	F. C. Watts
Golborne & Bevington Rds.	8.30 A. Anderson	A. Anderson	A. Anderson	A. Anderson
Tottenham, St. Anns Road	8.30 A. Anderson	A. Anderson	A. Anderson	A. Anderson
FRIDAYS.	6th.	13th.	20th.	27th.
Battersea, Prince's Head	8.30 T. A. Jackson	Fawcett & Roe	T. A. Jackson	E. Fairbrother
Paddington, Prince of Wales	8.30 F. C. Watts	J. H. Halls	F. C. Watts	T. W. Allen
Tooting Broadway	8.30 P. Dumenil	J. McManus	H. Newman	P. Dumenil

The
Official Organ
of
The
Socialist Party
of
Great Britain.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

No. 38. VOL. 4.]

LONDON, OCTOBER, 1907.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY

THE KIRKDALE BYE-ELECTION.

APPEALS to "Socialists" to close up their ranks and help in every possible way to return Mr. J. Blatchford to Parliament are falling fast and furious and the usual reasons are being advanced by those whose policy is changed as often as is demanded by the necessity to maintain the circulation of their newspapers, secure the attendance of the public in large numbers at their meetings or to bring themselves into prominence as "leaders" of the working class. Mr. Robert Blatchford, who for weeks in the columns of the *Clarion* has been explaining "Why the Labour Party is no good," now urges all Socialists and Labour men alike, to help to swell the ranks of the "useless" Labour Party by returning a candidate who will be as useless as the best of them. In the *Clarion Election Supplement* Mr. Blatchford eats his own words and declares that "the workers need a strong and United Labour Party" because "two ominous words, 'Conscription' and 'Protection' are being freely bandied about, and attacks, open or covert, are being made upon Trade Unionism and Education," and further, "The Liberal Party may be a better Party than the Tory Party, but the best Party for Labour is a Labour Party." And this whilst the ink is hardly dry on his utterances on the failure of the Labour Party and his declarations that only a Socialist Party will do! But then, Robert Blatchford is a journalist and also writes romances.

Edward Hartley, too, calls us "The S.D.F. 'To Arms! To Arms!'" He also, in *Justice* and elsewhere, has been asserting the necessity for a Socialist party, but like Blatchford and others, is not honest enough to admit that it exists in the Socialist Party of Great Britain. Hill should be helped because he "is not only the secretary of a strong and well-organised trade union (!) but a good Socialist who has advocated his principles for years." But, Hartley adds, "Even if he were not a Socialist, but only a Trade Unionist who would stand firm on the principle of independence in political action, he would be better than the best candidate who could be selected as either Liberal or Tory." We hope our friends who tell us they believe in our policy of hostility to all other parties, but who remain in the S.D.F. because they also believe that to be an uncompromising Socialist organisation, will note its willingness to support non-Socialists and even anti-Socialists under the conditions stated by Mr. Hartley.

Mr. Hartley says also that the Liberals find the Tory candidate so acceptable that there is to be no Liberal candidate, but on the other hand, it may be that the Liberals find Mr. Hill so acceptable that they prefer to leave the field open to him. After all, if at the General Election they were willing to assist "independent" candidates like Mr. Ramsay McDonald, Mr. T. F. Richards, Mr. Jas. Parker, Mr. G. J. Wardle and others into the House of Commons, why should they fight the Labour candidate now that they have discovered how "sensible, respectable and adaptable" the Labour members are? As the *Daily News* admitted,

when commenting on Mr. Gill's address at the Trade Union Congress "no Liberal who is in earnest about his creed . . . can do anything but rejoice in the strength of a party at once so sincere and so reasonable." And judging by his election address, no Liberal need fear the return of Mr. John Hill for the Kirkdale division. (Since the above was written the Kirkdale Liberal Divisional Council have passed a resolution urging the Liberal electors to vote for Mr. Hill.)

The *Labour Leader* prints certain portions of Mr. Hill's election address, and even from these it can be seen how far he is in conflict with the programs of the S.D.F. and the I.L.P. Amongst other things Mr. Hill says:—

ALIENS' BILL.

I deeply regret that through lack of employment at home British Workers are forced to go to other countries as "Blacklegs," or stay at home and starve. I am in favour of a Bill to give Protection to British Workers by the prohibition of Aliens being imported to take the place of men on strike, or to undercut or displace British Workers.

EDUCATION.

As a Nonconformist, I believe in simple Bible study—the Bible is still my best book: at the same time, Bible lessons should only be given to children at their parents' desire, as every parent should have the fullest opportunity to teach his child his own faith. I believe that religion thrives best and retains its sincerity without State interference.

TEMPERANCE.

As a total abstainer, I am in favour of the people of every town or parish having the fullest direct veto on the renewal of old licences or the granting of new ones. The common people ought to have the right to say whether or not temptation shall be beside their homes and amongst their children.

FRANCHISE.

I am in favour of Adult Suffrage. Meantime, I would support the agitation for the extension of the franchise to women on the same basis as it now is, or may be, extended to men. I also favour the Bill giving married women the right to vote on their husband's qualifications.

IN CONCLUSION.

As I am opposed to the present commercial system of production for profit, I would advocate in Parliament the Nationalisation of the production, distribution, and exchange of the common necessities of life. The enormous and ever increasing trade and wealth of the country is only tending to make the poor poorer, and rich richer and creating a luxurious, idle class on the one hand, and a starving unemployed class on the other. It is only by a more scientific system of society, a more just division of the products of labour, a system based on the ethics of Christ's teaching and work, that the workers shall be emancipated.

And it is on utterances such as these that the *Clarion*, the S.D.F., the I.L.P., and the Trade Unions unite! Such unity proves our case against them in regard to political action.

So far as we know Mr. Hill is the first "Labour" candidate to advocate the exclusion of aliens, and to adopt the Tariff Reformers' position that the low wages and lack of employment of the working class here are due to the admission of aliens. Evidently Mr. Hill is one of the "working-men Tariff Reform missionaries" that Mr. C. Arthur Pearson threatens shall take the field against Socialism. The paragraph concerning "Education" conflicts with the resolution of the Trade Union Congress, the program of the S.D.F. and the I.L.P., and again typifies the latitude allowed to "Labour" candidates for vote catching purposes, and proves conclusively how the S.D.F. and the I.L.P. will ignore their own programs in order to be "in the swim." Both these two bodies, also, are pledged to public ownership and control of the drink traffic, a "reform" which Mr. Hill does not support. His reference to "the common people" is an insult to the working class, and his plea for a more just division of the products of labour is an admission that the present system is just and all Mr. Hill wants is to make it more so!

There is only one course for the workers of Kirkdale to adopt, although the result will be announced before these lines are in print,—Abstain from voting. A candidate who will pander to all sections, as Mr. Hill, with the support of the S.D.F., the I.L.P., and the *Clarion*, is doing, proving thereby that he holds to no guiding principle beyond the personal desire to add the much coveted letters M.P. to his name, or, if we acquit him of this, showing conclusively that he does not comprehend the working-class position, is worse than useless to his class, and can only fall a victim, as the others have done, to the flattery and the hospitality of the master-class representatives. To serve the working-class a candidate must stand as a rebel, be prepared to act as a rebel if elected, and to take all the consequences of such action. Prating about "a system based on the ethics of Christ's teaching and work" after two thousand years of wars, barbarities, faction fights and other loving pleasantries which Christ's followers indulge in, may be a good card to play in Liverpool and the appeal no doubt goes straight to the heart of atheists like Robert Blatchford, and the leaders of the S.D.F. and the I.L.P. But neither by looking up to Christs nor down to devils, neither by appealing to politicians nor by relying upon "leaders" will the workers secure their emancipation. Only by realising that they are slaves, that there is no hope for them while Capitalism exists, that their emancipation can only be secured by abolishing, not palliating, the capitalist system and by organising themselves to take for themselves possession and control of all the means of producing and distributing wealth, will their historic mission be fulfilled. As voting for Mr. Hill would not assist them, but make the existing confusion worse confounded, we trust that the result will show that large numbers of the workers of Kirkdale have declined to vote for

(Continued on page 111.)

MARX OR MALTHUS?

THE demand for an "eight hours" day for all workers" by the enthusiastic young man whose estimate of the relative value of broken-bottles and bullets as missiles appears to be in need of some revision, led us to a study of J. M. Robertson's "The Eight Hours Question."

The member for Tyneside shows the uselessness of this particular "palliative" by a searching analysis of its effect in case of "particular legislation" in that direction. He simply "wipes the floor" with such "Socialist" opponents as Webb, Shaw, and S.D.F. Jones. His position may be summed up by the following quotations:

"They (Messrs. Webb & Co.) have undertaken to provide a manual of fact and theory for the politicians and labour leaders who have to deal with the question. Their only bias is the bias of sociological inclination. Yet their altruistic bias is quite as fatal in science as a mercenary one would have been inasmuch as it is even more likely to blind and mislead. Generosity and nobility of feeling will not suffice to decide the matter for those of us who feel that half the miseries of life spring from action undertaken from motives other than benevolence or genial."

Mr. Webb is sensitive about the ungenerousness of pointing out to the working-men that they are mistaken, but he seems to have no misgiving about leading thousands of them to the bitterest disappointment.

Waiving the question as to what is meant precisely by "sociological inclination," members of The Socialist Party of Great Britain will heartily concur in the foregoing: indeed, one might use the words as a text when combating the fluff sentimentalities of the I.L.P. who derives his "economics" from the New Testament (with profuse apologies to the Old), or the perfunctory oratory of the average S.D.F. on the question of "free maintenance," who, like Dick Dauntless in "Ruddygore," argues that it must be right so long "as your 'art' be your compass" in so far as "this 'ere 'eart of mine's a dictatun' to me like anythink."

But clearly as Robertson sees the futility of the legalised restriction of hours (and, incidentally, of other palliatives); although from his own historical and sociological works the fact of the "class struggle" might be deduced: while "economic causation" is the master-key by which he unlocks the mystery of the rapid spread of early Christianity; he fails to follow his own clues, and, obsessed by one idea (Neo-Malthusianism), proposes counter palliatives, which while they might lighten the burdens of a class doomed to remain in slavery for all time, are grotesquely beside the mark to those genuine Socialists with whose principles, apparently, the learned member has yet to become acquainted, Socialists who believe with him that "the one hope lies in the good sense of the more thoughtful workers, who ought to be the means of guiding aright the rest, they themselves listening to economic reason rather than to the blind impulse which attacks the symptom instead of the cause."

But here, oddly enough, our author, who elsewhere rightly insists upon the vital importance of verification of premises, takes for granted that the cause of poverty is overpopulation. In a book of 150 pages, there is not a line directly devoted to the proof of what he regards as the "essence" of Malthusian teaching, viz: "Population tends to increase in an excessive ratio to food"—which, to say the least, in a book which is practically a plea for "Neo-Malthusianism"—is a curious slip. His ludicrously easy task of exposing the absurdities of the Fabians does not justify him in the belief that he has exposed the errors of what he is pleased to call "a crude Marxian economics," still less does the fact that Gronlund made an error in his statement as to the debated question of the number of Malthus' children, or that Tom Mann gravely assures the worker that the lessened hours of labour will benefit both the proletarian and capitalist, justify him in the belief that he has established the truth of the precious "law," which "holds good no matter what be the efficiency or equality of the distribution of wealth." In the terms of his own main contention, having regard to the implied object of the book, (chapter 13 is called the "Population crisis,") J. M. Robertson's "The Eight Hours Question" must be regarded as a literary miscarriage, a splendid warning to Guy and Guenn in the avoidance of a *non sequitur*,

a striking example of the truth of the ever-recurring fact that scholarship, literary ability and even genuine sympathy with the worker, are absolutely no guarantee that the real issue for the worker can be more than glimpsed. The exhibition of possibly the most brainy man the Liberals can claim placing himself upon the level of palliative-mongering "Labour-leaders," and middle-class bureaucrats, whose fallacies he deplores, and whose antics he must despise, gives one "furiously to think." It becomes increasingly right, meet, and our bounden duty, at all times, and in all places, to strenuously oppose those who, whether by reason of mental obfuscation, or by reason of deliberate attempt to confuse the worker for their own ends—the two reasons merge only too easily in the "leader"—have inscribed "Socialism" on their banner, and are acting falsely to the grandly simple principles involved in that faith.

Lack of space forbids more than a cursory examination of the proposition that poverty is caused mainly by "overpopulation." J. M. Robertson, ashamed, apparently, of the crudely absurd proposition first enunciated by Malthus, viz., that population tends to double itself in geometrical progression, whilst subsistence can only be made to increase in arithmetical progression, contents himself with saying that "Population tends to increase in an excessive ratio to food." Now, it is evident that, put into its very simplest form, this must mean: the more food ("warmth and clothing" is somewhat illicitly smuggled in later on) available, the greater the birth-rate. Yet, on his own showing, the "upper" classes tend to reproduce less, and here the "food supply" is adequate, not to say excessive. Does Robertson maintain that this lessened rate is due to the adoption of Neo-Malthusian teachings? Grant even that such principles have been adopted, is it not flying in the face of all logical procedure, to assume that this lessened birth-rate is due only to the operation of that circumstance. Further, in ancient Greece and Rome, is it not a fact that the "lower orders" tended to increase at a faster rate than the "upper" classes? Were there Malthusians then? Was abortion and infanticide practised more by the patrician than by the proletarian, by the "citizen" than by the helot?

In all seriousness, one asks: Is there not sufficient food, or is it only the purchasing power to obtain food which the English wage-slave, the Indian ryot, the Irish peasant lacks? "When her population was at its highest Ireland was a food-exporting country. Even during the famine, grain, meat, butter, and cheese were carted for exportation along roads lined with the starving, and past trenches into which the dead were piled." Had that food been available, possibly, Robertson may retort, there would have been more reproduction and more want. On which very point one seeks in vain for anything approaching a proof, and is fobbed off with such gratuitous assertions as "With such general distribution of wealth as we all wish for, population would easily double in 20 years unless the lesson of prudential restraint be learned step for step with the improvement."

It is curious that it does not occur to the minds of Neo-Malthusians that there is another alternative worth considering, viz., that poverty causes overpopulation. The development of this point would result in lengthening an already over-long article. Perhaps the Editor will allow the point to be considered on another occasion. I content myself at present with pointing out that the lowly organisms which haunt the blood of man, and try deadly conclusions with the friendly phagocyte multiply in a way that the worthy Malthus would have called "very striking," and that, deprived of nourishment, several of the one-celled plants and animals protest by retiring into semi-privacy for a while, and then forming themselves into mere reproducing agents, one organism giving rise to innumerable "spores." "Neo" Malthusianism will hardly touch these degenerate beings.

Of course, the Socialist is well aware that the big fringe of unemployed tends ever more and more to aid the employer in beating down labour to a mere subsistence-wage, but he is also aware that this is because the worker, under our present system, is a mere commodity, a curious piece of mechanism differing only from the machine it minds in its power of producing surplus-value, in handing over to its owner the

handsome difference between its own cost of subsistence and the value of the commodities its labours have brought into being.

It is the duty of The Socialist Party of Great Britain to tell the workers in general, and the Malthusians in particular:—

(1) Whatever temporary good may accrue to a few individual workers from the adoption of their principles, no permanent benefits can possibly be gained by the working class as a whole.

(2) This particular palliative, along with its bosom friends Total Abstinence, Thrift, Clean Boots, Brushed Hair, and the New Theology will be preached to you by all sorts and conditions of men. The S.P. of G.B. will be at the old stand, giving a hand to Economic Pressure, who will not too gently, but firmly, persuade you that *Socialism is your only hope.*
A. REGINALD.

THE WASTE OF COMPETITION.

[From "The Industrial Revolution," by CHARLES BEARD, preface to second edition.]

WHILE admitting that our present maladjustments are the outcome of the "social form of production and the individual form of appropriation and exchange," I contend that this system wastes more wealth than it contributes to landlords, capitalists and money lenders. The statistics are not at present forthcoming to prove this statement, but a few figures will illustrate my point.

Mr. Edson Bradley, vice-president of the Distillery Company of America, recently estimated that between producer and consumer 40,000,000 dollars were annually lost mostly in competitive attempts to secure trade. Upon the combination of the competitors of the distilling business 300 travelling salesmen were discharged, and a saving of 1,000,000 dollars effected in this one department of enterprise. The American Wire and Steel Company, formed of competing concerns, dismissed 200 salesmen who had been engaged in "heckling" customers. It is stated that 3,000 salesmen lost their positions through the formation of the American Tobacco Co., and that the Continental Tobacco Co. discharged 350 travellers in one day. The (1900) Report of the American Travellers' Protective Association stated that probably 350,000 travelling men had lost their positions through the workings of monopolies and trusts, and estimated that the latter saved 6,000,000 dollars daily by limiting advertising and concentrating industries.

The recent American Combination of Laundry Machine-makers discharged 30 per cent. of the employees as unnecessary to the production of all the machines demanded in the market, and effected a saving of 780,000 dollars annually in working expenses. Mr. Gates of the Wire and Steel Co. stated that his concern saved 500,000 dollars yearly in "cross freights" through combination and organisation of shipping. A prominent railway manager in the United States estimates that 200,000,000 dollars would be saved annually if all railways were worked from one centre. Professor Ely says: "It is useless to attempt any precise estimate, but it may not be an extravagant estimate if we claim that the loss due to competition in the railway business in the United States from the beginning of our railway history to the present time has been sufficient to furnish all the people of the United States with comfortable dwellings, provided all the houses now in the United States should be destroyed." To read this statement with the recent "Report on Tenement conditions in Chicago" is enough to rouse the most indifferent. The annual waste on railways, advertising and telegraphs in the United States is estimated at 698,000,000 dollars while the waste on separate railway management in England is set at £30,000,000 yearly.

It is calculated that there are in London two and a half times as many shops as are necessary for convenient and efficient distribution.

Business men struggling with one another waste an enormous amount of wealth, and capitalists and workmen fighting each other waste a great deal in addition. For example, in 1897-98 25,636,000 working days were lost through labour disputes arising out of the inevitable antagonism existing in the modern industrial system.

[CONTINUED FROM AUGUST ISSUE.]

THE PROLETARIAT

(The Working Class).

By KARL KAUTSKY.

Specially translated for The Socialist Party of Great Britain and approved by the Author.

2. WAGES.

Wages cannot be so high as to make it impossible for the capitalist to carry on his business and to live from it. For under these circumstances it would be more advantageous for the capitalist to give up business altogether. Hence the wages of the worker can never rise high enough to equal the value of his product. They must always leave a margin, a surplus value, for only the prospect of this margin induces the capitalist to buy labour-power. Thus in capitalist society wages can never rise so high that the exploitation of the worker comes to an end.

But the margin, the surplus value, is greater than is generally supposed. It consists not only of the profit of the manufacturer, but also much that is reckoned as cost of production and sale, viz., ground rent, interest on invested capital, discount for the merchant who disposes of the goods produced by the industrialist, taxes, rates, etc. All this comes out of the surplus value which the product of the worker yields above his wages. This margin must consequently be considerable if an undertaking is to prove profitable. Wages can, therefore, never rise sufficiently high to enable the worker to receive in his wages anything approaching the value he has created. The capitalist wage system means under all circumstances exploitation of the worker. It is impossible to abolish exploitation so long as that system exists, and even where high wages are being paid the exploitation of the worker must be extensive.

But wages hardly ever reach the highest possible point, more often, however, they fall to the very lowest. That point is reached when the wages of the worker cease to purchase his very necessities of life. If the worker not only starves but starves quickly, his work ceases altogether.

Between these two limits wages fluctuate, becoming lower as the customary wants of life of the workers decrease, and as the supply of labour-power in the labour market increases, and as the power of resistance on the part of the workers decreases.

Generally wages must, of course, be high enough to keep the worker in a fit state to work, or better said, wages must be so high as to ensure to the capitalist the measure of labour-power needed by him. Wages must hence be high enough to make it possible for the worker not only to maintain himself in a fit state to work but also to reproduce children fit to work.

The economic development shows the tendency—so favourable to the capitalist—of reducing the cost of maintenance of the workers and of thereby decreasing wages.

Skill and strength were in times gone by indispensable to the worker. The period of apprenticeship of the handicraftsman was a very long one, and the cost of his maintenance was considerable. Progress in the division of labour and in machine construction caused special skill and strength in production to become superfluous. This progress makes it possible to replace skilled by unskilled—that is cheaper—labour-power; it makes it also possible to replace the labour of men by that of weak women, and even children. Even in manufacture this tendency was perceptible; but only with the introduction of machinery begins wholesale exploitation of women and of children of tender age, exploitation of the most helpless of the helpless who fall victims to revolting ill-treatment and spoliation. Here we get acquainted with a new characteristic of the machine in the hands of Capital.

The wage-worker who did not belong to the family of the employer had originally to receive in his wages not only the cost of his own maintenance but also that of his family if he were to be in a position to reproduce his species, to regenerate his labour-power. Without this reproduction of labour-power the heirs of the capitalist would find no proletariat to exploit. But if the wife, and, from early childhood, also the children of the worker are in a position to provide for themselves, the wages of the male worker can almost entirely be reduced to the cost of maintenance of his own person without the slightest danger to the reproduction of labour-power. And the labour of women and children has the further advantage of their being less capable of resistance than men. Moreover, through their entering the ranks of labour the supply of labour-power in the labour market is tremendously increased.

The labour of women and children does not only lower the cost of maintaining the worker, it reduces also his power of resistance and increases the supply of labour-power—in short, it has the effect under any of these circumstances of causing the wages of the worker to fall.

3. THE DISSOLUTION OF THE PROLETARIAN FAMILY.

The industrial labour of woman in capitalist society means the entire destruction of the worker's family life without substituting a higher form of family. The capitalist mode of production, in most cases, does not dissolve the individual working-class household, but it deprives it of all its brightness, leaving only its dark side with the waste of woman's energy and her exclusion from public life. The industrial labour of woman to-day does not mean her relief from household duties, it means adding a fresh burden to those she already bears. But one cannot serve two masters. The household of the worker goes to wreck and ruin if his wife has to assist in earning subsistence for the

family; but what present society puts in place of the individual household and the individual family is miserable refuse—the soap-kitchen and the day-nursery in which the leavings of the physical and mental nourishment of the rich are thrown to the lower classes.

Socialism is accused of aiming at the destruction of the family. Well, we know that each particular mode of production has its particular form of household to which corresponds a particular form of family. We do not consider the present form of family to be the last, and expect that a new form of Society will also develop a new form of family. But such expectation is something altogether different to an endeavour to dissolve all family ties. Those who destroy the family—who not merely want to do, but actually DO destroy it before our eyes—are not the Socialists but the capitalists. Many a slave owner in the past has torn husband from wife, parents from children able to work; but capitalist methods surpass the abominations of slavery; they tear the suckling from the mother, forcing her to entrust her infant to the care of strangers. And a society in which that occurs daily in hundreds and thousands of cases, a society that has specially founded "charitable institutions patronised by the nobility" for the purpose of making it easier for the mother to part from her child—such a society has the audacity to reproach us with intending to dissolve the family, because we are convinced that household-work will develop into a special branch of industry, thereby transforming the character of the household and of family life.

4. PROSTITUTION.

Besides being reproached with the intention of dissolving the family we are accused of aiming at community of women. This reproach is as void of foundation as the other. We assert on the contrary that the very opposite of community of women, of sexual compulsion and immorality, namely, ideal love, will form the basis of all marital relations in the Socialist Commonwealth, and such love can generally prevail only in such a state of Society. But what do we see to-day? The want of resistance on the part of women who have hitherto been confined to their households and have mostly but a faint conception of public life and the power of organisation—is so great, that the capitalist employer dare pay them wages which do not suffice for their sustenance, and incite them to prostitution as a means of augmenting their wages. An increase in the industrial employment of women has everywhere the tendency of causing an increase in prostitution. In the modern state of the fear of God and pious morals there exist entire "flourishing" branches of industry in which the women workers are so badly paid that they would have to starve to death were they not to stoop to prostitution. And the employers declare that just upon these low wages depends the possibility of their successful competition, and that higher wages would ruin them.

Prostitution is as old as the contradiction between poverty and riches. But in ages gone by prostitutes occupied in the social scale a position falling between those of beggars and scamps, constituting a luxury in which Society could afford to indulge, and the loss of which would by no means have endangered the very existence of that society. To-day it is not only the women of the lazing proletariat but working women, who are compelled to sell their bodies for money. This selling of their bodies is no longer only a matter of luxury, no, it has become the basis of industrial development. In the capitalist system of production prostitution becomes one of the pillars of Society. The defenders of this society themselves practise community of women, the vice of which they accuse us; of course, community with women of the Proletariat. And this method of community of women has taken root so deeply in present society that its representatives declare prostitution to be a necessity. They cannot conceive that the abolition of the Proletariat must mean the abolition of prostitution, because they cannot possibly conceive a society without community of women.

The community of women of to-day is an invention of the "higher" grades of Society, not of the Proletariat. This community of women is one of the ways of exploiting the Proletariat. It is not Socialism, but its very opposite.

RIOTOUS LIVING FOR SAILORS.

Another great reform has been carried out by the Liberal Government. In future the value of the total messing allowance for sailors will remain at 10d., but they will have a smaller ration, equivalent to 6d., and will be allowed to spend the remaining 4d. in *luxuries* as they please. We may now expect them to participate in banquets at frequent intervals, just as if they were "Labour" M.P's.

HOW WILL THORNE FOUGHT.

Addressing the Forest Gate Ratepayers' Association on September 2nd, Councillor Duncan Best, of West Ham, declared that Mr. Will Thorne, "in order to obtain the salary given by the L.R.C., was quite willing at the general election to furl the red flag—quite willing to tuck it away and appear purely as Labour man." But Councillor Best is late—we pointed this out long ago.

LABOUR MEMBERS SOLD AGAIN.

An example of the extent to which the Government is being "forced" by the existence of a "powerful Labour party" may be gleaned from some notes by J. Ramsay MacDonald in the *Belper News* of August 23rd. He claims that the Fair Wages Committee was appointed on the initiative of the Labour party. After many months "pressing" the Government and "negotiating" with them, a Committee was appointed consisting of those officials whom the Labour party had accused of making the Fair Wages Clause a dead letter.

What else could he expect? When the Labour members fight the Government instead of being so anxious to dine and drink expensive wines with its members something different may happen.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, subscriptions for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, articles, correspondence and advertisements submitted for insertion therein should be addressed.—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 22, Great James Street, London, W.C., to whom Money Orders should be payable.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD is published on the first day in each month.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office every Tuesday at 7 p.m.

Terms of Subscriptions.

UNITED KINGDOM.	
Twelve Months	1s. 6d.
Six Months	9d.
AMERICA.	
Twelve Months	50 cents.
Six Months	25 cents.

Scale of Charges for Advertisements.

Per Inch, One Insertion	6 s. d.
Quarter Column do.	0 2 0
Half Column do.	0 5 0
One Column do.	1 0 0

Special arrangements will be made for Advertisements to be inserted in more than one issue.

The Socialist Standard.



"Our Wonderful Prosperity."

A Board of Trade return issued in support of Free Trade and giving figures showing the phenomenal amount of wealth that is created by those who do not enjoy it, was recently seized upon by the *Daily Chronicle* in an endeavour to convince the working man that he is prosperous. The figures, however, to the seeing eye show how fundamental is the great class antagonism; and although the "national wealth" is spoken of and the amount per head calculated, it is seen that there are not one but two nations—those who live by labour and those who live upon those who labour—and that the hirelings who live by labour stand without the pale of this wonderful prosperity.

In reviewing the figures the *Daily Chronicle* did not refer to the significant increase in pauperism, lunacy, degeneration and unemployment that has been apparent during the past decade. It referred, it is true, to the fact that the cost of pauperism had nearly doubled since 1861, but tried to minimise this by stating that the proportion of paupers had decreased from 364 per 1,000 in 1861 to 249 per 1,000 in 1906. These figures, however, by no means show that the conditions of the working class have improved even compared with such an unfavourable period as 1861, for it is evident to all who have any knowledge of the history of the Poor Laws that the decline in pauperism has been due (as Ashcroft and Preston Thomas point out in "The English Poor Law System"), to the progressive imposition of more onerous conditions of relief and more rigorous tests, to the compulsory stay of vagrants and to the rigorous restriction of outdoor relief.

These facts, however, are carefully hidden by the capitalist statistician, and he will complacently point to the decline in pauperism until recently as proof of a decline in poverty, while in reality it shows no such thing, for it is the result of the golden rule of capitalist poor "relief," to make conditions of "relief" so onerous that the workers will—as indeed they do—rather starve than accept of it. It is most eloquent of the workers' condition, that in spite of this the past few years have seen an actual increase in pauperism.

Work and Wages.

All who have studied working-class conditions know that the poverty and unemployment of that class is terrible indeed, and that figures drawn from returns made from a few "aristocrats of labour" are utterly inadequate to convey the depth of the poverty or extent of unemployment among the toilers as a whole, many of

whom sink yearly into the hopeless and increasing mass of slumdom through the pressure of economic circumstances. Rates of wages are also used by many to give a totally inaccurate impression, for no allowance is usually made for unemployment, "short time" or sickness. It being so arranged that if a workman gets for six months a wage of 30/- weekly and is compelled to be idle for the rest of the year, his wages are nevertheless represented not as 15/- but as 30/- per week.

One or two items of working-class consumption are given that show a decline in price, but no allowance whatever is made for the adulteration and reduction in quality which are daily more apparent in all things consumed by the workers; while the fact that house room and many household necessities and provisions have increased in price is rarely mentioned.

The figures given by the Liberal M.P. for Paddington are, indeed, significant enough in themselves, for they show that one million people possess nearly one half of the income of the country. Yet Liberal organs parade the growing "wealth of the country" before the impoverished and worn-out toiler as proof to him that he is prosperous.

The "prosperity of the country" means the prosperity of those who own the country, not of the working class, and those who deny the class antagonism should endeavour to explain how it is that while the so-called national wealth increases by leaps and bounds the condition of those who produce this wealth shows no improvement, but that their employment grows less secure and their toil more intense.

Middle-Class "Socialism."

In a communication to the *Magazine of Commerce*, Mr. H. G. Wells, whom the *Clarion* hails as a "prominent Socialist," gives his views as to whether a capable business man stands to gain or lose by the coming of a Socialist Government.

"I submit," says Mr. H. G. Wells, "that, on the whole, he stands to gain. Let me put down the essential points in his outlook as I conceive them."

"Under a Socialist legislation—

"He will be restricted from methods of production and sale that are socially mischievous.

"He will pay higher wages.

"He will pay a higher proportion of his rate-rent out-goings to the State and municipality and less to the landlord.

"These items in his outlook the business man may contemplate with doubt, but, on the other hand,

"He will get better educated, better fed, and better trained workers.

"He will get a regular, safe, cheap supply of power and material. He will get cheaper and more efficient internal and external transit.

"He will be under an organised scientific State, which will naturally pursue a vigorous scientific policy in support of the national trade.

"He will be less of an adventurer and more of a citizen."

As with other so-called Socialists of the middle class, Mr. Wells makes it plain that his conception of Socialism is a middle-class heaven wherein, although higher wages may be paid, yet only so because it is the price of a more efficient and more profitable labour-power.

Wherein, in fact, the capitalist will get cheap labour, cheap material, cheap power and cheap transit and where he will sell at an advantage because "the State will pursue a vigorous scientific policy in support of the national trade."

We commend the utterances of Mr. Wells to the careful attention of our readers for it illustrates yet again that the "Socialism" professed by middle-class would-be leaders of the workers is directly opposed to the interests of the working class and is as much the enemy as Liberalism or Toryism. It is, indeed, but capitalism with a thin disguise of bunkum. It is a state of society specially designed to provide greater profit and power to the decaying middle class, where the Trust shall cease from troubling and the Receiver be at rest, and where also the wage-slaves shall be more efficient and profitable to the end that the "intellect" and "ability" of the middle class, rescued from bankruptcy by the "Labour" movement, may scoop in all the profit.

Order THE SOCIALIST STANDARD through your local newsagent. If you have any difficulty in obtaining it regularly please communicate with the S.P.G.B., 22, Gt. James St., London, W.C.

A LOOK ROUND.

The fact that Victor Grayson fought Colne Valley without the sanction of the Labour Party has upset several members of that "sensible, respectable, and adaptable" collection of odds and ends. Writing in the *A.S.E. Journal* for August, Mr. G. N. Barnes says that "each section should endeavour to fall in line with due regard to the general situation. Otherwise there may be more or less irregular candidatures leading to friction and a breaking up of the solidarity which has so far characterised the Labour Party. If Socialists, for instance, are going to run candidates 'on their own' without regard to the feelings of the Trade Unionist section, and, as in this case, without consulting the party as a whole, then Trade Unionists may be disposed to return the compliment."

Mr. Barnes' reference to "solidarity" is amusing. Even the *Daily News* for September 3rd wrote concerning it: "Its members are but loosely joined together: in its small aggregation it comprehends the extremes of opinion. To-day they are often seen walking into different lobbies in Parliament."

The following report appeared in the *Times* of August 27th:—

"The 'Survivors' of the all-night sittings' of August 19 and 20 dined together at the House of Commons last night, among those present being Mr. Whitely, Mr. J. A. Pease, Mr. Herbert Lewis, the Master of Ellbank, Mr. Fuller, Captain Norton, and Mr. Whitley (Liberal Whips), Mr. H. W. Forster and Mr. Pike Pease (Unionist Whips), and Messrs. Burns, Cavendish, Hobhouse, T. W. Russell, Ainsworth, G. Baring, W. Benn, Bowerman, Carr-Gomm, Clough, C. H. Corbett, Courthope, C. Duncan, Dunn, Fenwick, Gill, Goddard, C. L. Hamsworth, Harworth, A. Henderson, Henry, Igham, Illingworth, MacVeagh, Mansfield, Markham, Nicholls, John O'Connor, Pearce, C. E. Price, Rainey, T. F. Richards, Silcock, A. Stanley, Whitehead, and W. T. Wilson. The menu for the occasion was something in the nature of a novelty, among the dishes being 'Consommé Tortue à la Banbury,' 'Harengs aux Baleines Ecoassais, Sauce Wason,' 'Gelée Lloyd George,' 'Harcourts Verts petite culture,' 'Grouse de Hampstead Heath (Tué par M. Whiteley et Sir Hood),' 'Pêches Anglaises sucrées, sans impôt (Garanties par M. Jean Burns),' 'Moelles pain dore du Sud Afrique à la Chinois,' 'Dessert de 45 héros,' and 'Gâteau (Gagne par M. Jeremie McVeagh).' The wines were described as 'Moselle Piesporter Cuvée Caisse Fermée Ministère de Finance, Ad Hoc,' 'Champagne Cuvée Dorsdors' and 'Porte! Porte! Dow's 1878.' The concluding line on the menu was 'Prorogation—Le Roi le veult.'"

Subject to correction, the "Survivors" named Bowerman, Duncan, Gill, Henderson, and T. F. Richards are "Labour" members. Who paid?

Lord William Cecil is recording, in the columns of the *Times*, the impressions of his recent visit to China, where he went with the object of seeing the Christian missions at work in that portion of the Far East. What he has to say is far from reassuring says the *Church Times*. He found only too convincing proof of the tendency among European residents in China to sink to the lower moral standard of the Orientals. Foreseeing a time when China, like Japan, will enter into close relation and intercourse with the West, he dreads a Yellow Peril no less serious than the peril of aggression, which he believes to be imaginary. The Yellow Peril he fears is that of moral contamination for Europe, through the adoption of Chinese morals and ideas.

To meet this Lord William thinks that every effort should be made to make known the religion of Christ to the Chinese! But a knowledge of this religion has not prevented the Europeans from falling!

The correspondence in the *Church Times* on Socialism was brought to a close on September

15th with a letter from Mr. Harry Phillips, writing from the Church House, Westminster. He "was once a member of the L.L.P., but is not now," as he "can no longer support Labour when it declares for secular education!"

In the course of his letter Mr. Phillips says: "Under the rule of a strong Socialist majority on the West Ham Town Council, there was more poverty, more suffering, and greater want of employment, than at any other period during the history of West Ham, and had it not been for the generous subscriptions of strong individualists and capitalists like Mr. Dewar, and others, the suffering would have been a great deal worse; it was exactly the same at Poplar. I am not now alluding to the bribery and corruption of a few men, none of whom were Labour men, nor am I in any sense attacking any Socialist members of the Town Council, but the administration during the Socialist regime instead of reducing poverty, intensified it. Rates and rent went up enormously, and unemployment and suffering increased."

Now, even a Christian Socialist might try to tell the truth sometimes! There never has been a Socialist majority on the West Ham Town Council, and far from rates and rent going up enormously, it is a well-known fact that in West Ham and in districts further East rents have fallen considerably, although rates have risen. As we have repeatedly shown, a rise in rates is not always followed by a rise in rents, but, on the other hand, rents often fall concurrently with rising rates. The landlords always secure the full amount that competition for house accommodation will permit them to exact, irrespective of rates. And very often high rates mean low assessments, and low rates high assessments.

In their efforts to capture the working class for Christ the parsons are ably assisted by some of the Labour Misleaders. Mr. G. J. Wardle, M.P., speaking at Brixham Congregational Church on Aug. 25 delivered himself as follows: "There were thousands of men who had to work hard from week to week, and yet at the end there was nothing for them but the workhouse and a pauper's grave. Every working-man who was discontented with the present conditions was so because he knew that life to him was not what it ought to be and what it might be. Under a system of industry in which they could see the Divine hand, he knew that there would not only be security of tenure, but no unreasonably long hours and small wages, whilst he would have those comforts which health demanded."

Mr. Wardle, apparently, has no conception of a time when the working man shall cease to be such, as distinguished from the non-working section of the community. No, all that is wanted is "fixity of tenure" (which apparently means that the workman's nose is to be fixed to the grindstone) and not unreasonably long hours or unreasonably small wages. These of course are very vague terms, suitable to the occasion. And what reason has Mr. Wardle for suggesting that the Divine hand (whatever that may be) is not to be seen in the present system of industry?

At the annual demonstration of the Blairstown district of the South Wales Miners' Federation on August 26th dissatisfaction was expressed at the action of Mr. T. Richards, Labour M.P. for West Monmouth, in supporting Liberal candidates. Mr. Richards, in reply, said that he went to support the Liberal candidate at Bristol at the request of a Labour Leader (whom he did not name) and he was not sorry that he had helped to return Mr. Robinson, the Liberal member for Breconshire. Loud cheers greeted his speech, after which Mr. W. Crooks, M.P., addressed the meeting, no doubt on the "solidarity" of the Labour Party.

At a Primrose League demonstration Lord Londonderry spoke of the great and growing danger of Socialism to the State. He said: "There is £152,000,000 in the Post Office

Savings Bank, the savings of ten million persons, for the Socialists to take. A million and three-quarter persons have put nearly £53,000,000 in trustee savings banks. Some £68,000,000 has been placed by workmen in building societies, and there is some £50,000,000 invested in industrial and provident societies, co-operative and friendly societies, and trade union benefit funds, while small holders hold some £20,000,000 worth of Government stock.

"All these are workmen's savings, and they are all to be confiscated by the Socialists, all to be shared by the thrifless, all to be looted by the 'have nots' at the expense of those who have something."

These figures make a total of £343,000,000, and as we showed last month, there is only about £100,000,000 of money in the Kingdom, so that even under Capitalism these "workmen" would be in a bad way if they wanted to withdraw their savings in a hurry. It is unfortunate that his Lordship did not give the numbers of all these various kinds of thrifty workmen. But according to him the depositors in the P.O. and Trustee savings banks number 11,750,000 "workmen." The Industrial and Provident Societies have about 2,250,000 members and the Trade Unionists number about 2,000,000. Exclusive, then, of the Building Societies, at least 16,000,000 "workmen" have deposited all these savings. But the workers only number about 13,000,000, or, with their dependents, 33,000,000. And of these, according to Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, 13,000,000 are always on the verge of hunger!

The sums mentioned by his Lordship do not represent the savings of the working class. Take the P.O. for example. The commercial and trading class know what the working class, as a rule, do not, viz., that deposits are unattachable, that is, that in event of a bankruptcy, deed of composition, or any other circumstance, the creditors of a depositor in the P.O. Savings Bank cannot touch his or her deposit. Hence many of these wide-awake folk deposit up to the limit (£200) as a sort of provision against a "rainy day."

The working class (S.D.F. resolutions notwithstanding) have nothing to lose but their chains. This also applies to many members of the "respectable classes," the clerks and shop assistants, and many of their chains are "duds," as watch snatchers have sometimes found, to their chagrin.

The S.D.F. is continually passing resolutions, and sending them to various representatives of the master class and the latest is a "stunner."

Thus saith the S.D.F. Executive: "That this meeting of the Executive Committee of the S.D.F. enters its emphatic protest against the invitation given by King Edward VII on behalf of the British nation to the German Kaiser, and declares its intention to make this protest publicly effective upon his visit in London if necessary, seeing that the presence of a reactionary militarist such as the Kaiser is in no wise welcome among a free and self-respecting people."

The issue of *Justice* which contained this resolution contained also "A Practical Suggestion for Socialist Unity" by E. R. Hartley, from which it was apparent that E.R.H. desires "Socialist" Unity in order to send to Parliament "someone who shall speak with confidence and authority." This "someone" is "H. M. Hyndman." E.R.H. waxes enthusiastic. "Hyndman, the economist, the educated gentleman, the polished and scholarly traveller. . . . Hyndman, with his sublime capacity for magnificent indiscretions" and so on. Evidently the resolution quoted above is one of Hyndman's "magnificent indiscretions."

Consider the position. In its literature and on its platforms, the S.D.F. declare that the people of this country are slaves. Mr. Hyndman has gone further and has denounced all those who are not class-conscious Socialists as "slaves

and curs indeed." Now, slaves and curs cannot be "free and self-respecting." The S.D.F. Executive have allowed their jingoism to get the better of their Socialism, and in pursuit of their policy of currying favour with the jingo and "patriotic" section of the master class, of which the advocacy of compulsory military training forms a part, have thrown their Socialism overboard again, and declared what they know is a lie, viz., that the people of this country are "free and self-respecting."

J. KAY.

PARTY NOTES.

We understand that some members of the S.D.F. are elated because the *Star* of September 12th referred to this Party as "a small secession from the S.D.F. and about as worthy of this blaze of public attention as the tailors of Tooley St." Well, let them elate. It used to be a dictum in the S.D.F. that when any section of the capitalist Press attacked it or its members, it was evidence that those attacked were doing good work, and *vice versa*. But things have altered considerably, hence the "small secession."

The occasion of the *Star's* wrath was a letter in the *Daily Telegraph* from Mr. L. P. Sidney, secretary of the Middle Classes Defence Organisation, in which he pointed out that the S.P.G.B. was "even more explicit" than either the S.D.F. or the Communist Manifesto in declaring "war to the knife against the classes!"

Of course, Mr. Sidney's letter misrepresented the position. We do not preach war "against the classes." We recognise but two classes, the master class and the working class. Between these two there is war, war which can only be ended by the abolition of classes.

Mr. Sidney quotes the Manifesto of the S.P.G.B. and draws special attention to its references to the Fabian Society. But it also states our reasons for opposing the S.D.F., I.L.P., S.L.P., Labour Party, etc. Send 1d. for a copy to Head Office, 22, Great James Street, W.C.

In the *Clarion* of August 30th, Mr. Gavan Duffy reports the presentation to him of a "Socialist Unity" pen, and claims that S.P.G.B.ers contributed to it. Enquiries amongst our local branches enable us to state definitely that his statement is untrue.

Nos. 1 to 36 of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD (September, 1904 to August, 1907) are now bound together as one volume and the E.C. has decided to offer a limited number of these at 5/6 each, post free. The volume is a unique record of the work of the Party, and should be secured by all students of working-class politics. Orders, accompanied by postal order, should be sent to Head Office.

An interesting article, describing Mr. Fred Bramley's encounter with the Socialists in Finsbury Park will appear in our next issue.

There is a good prospect of forming a branch in Walthamstow, where the Tottenham branch are holding good meetings every Saturday evening, outside 110e Street Station. Those wishing to join should communicate with the secretary of the Tottenham branch. See last page.

A branch has been started in Manchester. Why does Burnley wait?

The new pamphlet "Art, Labour and Socialism," by William Morris, is now ready. Usual terms to branches.

The Head Office of The Socialist Party of Great Britain is at 22, Great James Street, London, W.C.

THE TRADE UNION CONGRESS.

ONCE again the "function whose chief value lies in its fraternisings and picnicks" to quote a prominent Labour journalist, has been held. Once again long resolutions, tending to obscure the issue, have been proposed, seconded and carried by the representatives of 1,700,000 organised workers, which organised workers will think no more about those resolutions until some of them read of the doings of the next Congress twelve months hence.

The usual course of procedure was followed. The Congress was officially opened on Monday, when addresses of welcome were delivered by the Mayor and Councillors of Bath. "The speeches were excellently suited to the occasion." Had the worthy city fathers anticipated that the deliberations of the delegates would in any way affect the foundations of that society in which they play the part of oppressors, sages and circus performers at different times, they would have been otherwise engaged. After the lions had welcomed the lambs and the lambs had dutifully bleated their thanks, Congress proceeded to appoint tellers and other temporary officials at a guinea or so a nob, and after the usual scramble for these jobs the delegates adjourned for a garden party!

On the previous day the S.D.F. trio, Lady Warwick, Mrs. Bridges Adams and Will Thorne, assisted by other Gas Workers, held an education meeting at which they advocated the usual palliatives concerning which that other S.D.F. star turn, Mr. Hyndman, once remarked, "The crushing law of competition would decree that those educated, well-fed children should, on reaching maturity, be only better wage-slaves for capitalists." The gospel-temperance wing of the Liberal Party also secured Mr. W. Crooks for a temperance meeting.

On Tuesday the delegates assembled to hear the address of the president, Mr. A. H. Gill, M.P., who, like Mr. Shackleton, would lose his seat if he advocated the abolition of child labour in the factories. Of course the address referred to the victories Labour has already secured because of the presence of a Labour Party in the House of Commons. The Trades Disputes Act and the Workmen's Compensation Act were especially mentioned, although, as we have several times shown, these Acts are not worth the paper they are printed on. Even this was partly admitted at the Congress. Mr. Parker, of the National Engineers' Society, pointed out that insurance companies declined to effect policies in the case of older workers, with the consequence that these were thrown out of employment. It may interest Mr. Parker to know that the Manchester Unemployed Committee have just issued a report in which they state that their efforts have been greatly hampered because employers, owing to the Workmen's Compensation Act, decline to employ other than young men, and that the Bodmin Guardians have resolved "that the fact that insurance companies are declining to accept the risks incurred by the employment of semi-incapacitated workmen will tend to seriously increase the cost of out-relief, as many who are now able to earn a partial livelihood will be debarred from employment altogether, and will thus be thrown entirely on the rates. The Board therefore urges that the Workmen's Compensation Acts should be amended either by a system of contracting-out in such cases or otherwise, so as to obviate the difficulties which may arise when employees through age or infirmity become uninsurable at the ordinary rates of premium." And after this Congress passed the usual resolution in favour of a pension of 5s. per week for all workers over 60 years of age. What is to happen to them between 40 and 60?

The president's utterances concerning Machinery and Unemployment were interesting, and showed that whilst he has somewhat of a grasp of the cause of unemployment he does not see that that cause is inherent in the capitalist system. He pointed out that owing to machinery and speeding up "the productive capacity in the

various departments has increased (during the last 30 years) by fully 25 per cent. with the same number of workmen in the same time." And as a remedy he urged an Eight Hours Day and concentrated effort to secure the "best possible wages on working the machine." It has time after time been demonstrated that a reduction of hours means at least as great productivity, and it does not occur to Mr. Gill that the working class should organise to take over and control the machinery which is throwing them out of employment.

The debate on Labour "Unity" was interesting in that it showed that the majority of the "independent" Labour members have never really believed that the Liberal Party stand for the master class as against the working class. They desire to form a "United Labour Party" by working with men whose Liberalism cannot be questioned, and who, if the "independent" attitude of the L.R.C. men is the correct one, are enemies to their class. In the end the Congress instructed the Parliamentary Committee to continue its efforts in the direction of "Unity."

The Government were urged to abolish the House of Lords! It was claimed that it was an "obstacle to the efficient carrying into effect of the declared expression of the people's will through their elected representatives." And yet we are also told that the presence of only 30 Labour members in the Commons has resulted in the passing of many important measures for the benefit of the working class. Why, then, worry about the Lords?

The proposal for a minimum wage of 30s. per week of 48 hours for adult workers in the London district gave Mr. D. C. Cummings and Mr. Shackleton, M.P., the opportunity to warn the delegates that they were really going too fast and ought to slow down! Poor old David will have to "stand from under" when the workers do commence to go fast.

By 1,239,060 votes to 126,000 Congress carried a long resolution on Education, which included a demand for purely secular instruction. What effect this has upon Trade Unionists may be gathered from Mr. John Hill's election address and speeches.

Many other resolutions were passed and ultimately the delegates went their several ways. What has been accomplished for the working class? Nothing, simply nothing. If all the reforms which were demanded were passed would the relative position of the master class and the working class be altered? No. Even if the 1,700,000 "organised workers" were prepared to support, on the industrial field, the efforts of the Parliamentary Committee to secure reforms from Parliament (which, of course, they are not) the inevitable march of capitalist development would nullify the effect of any reforms so secured, as it has done even with the much vaunted results of Labour Party activity. The Congress provides a jovial interlude in the yearly life of prominent Trade Unionists, and that is the only justification for its continuance. Does any delegate, from Thorne and other S.D.F. men down to the respectable nonconformists who proposed the resolution commencing "recognising that great and permanent principles which are essential to the well-being of human Society underlie the ancient institution of the Sabbath" honestly believe that they can moralize a capitalist government into passing into law all the "demands" formulated at the Congress? And if not, if they must wait until we have a class-conscious proletariat, do they think a class-conscious proletariat will concern itself with such matters as these? Assuredly not: it will take over the means of life and organise industry in the interest of all. Reforms such as those demanded by the Congress may and probably will be carried into effect by a capitalist Government to stave off the final overthrow of Capitalism, but even then it is clear that the surest way to secure reform is to organise for Socialism.

T. R. EASURER.

BIRDS OF A FEATHER.

The first number of *The Woman Worker* has appeared. It contains letters wishing success from many Labour M.P.s, and also from the Bishop of Birmingham, H. G. Wells, George Cadbury, Chiozza Money, H. Quelch, Herbert Gladstone and other reformers.

SOCIALISM OR REFORM?

TWO LETTERS ON TACTICS.

To the Editor THE SOCIALIST STANDARD.

Dear Sir,—I saw the July number of your journal in the local public library and straightway sat down to read it. What struck me most was your vigorous hostility towards the Labor Party. Being an ardent Socialist myself I would much rather the Labor Party in Parliament was Socialist, but if this was so I cannot see how they could have acted any different if a start was to be made at all in bettering the lot of the poorer working class. Socialism is utterly impossible until the people become Socialists, and as the time is very far distant when the people will decide that it is only by Socialism that Society will become a healthy organism it becomes necessary for us to adopt reasonable methods. It surely cannot be urged that to try and obtain immediate relief for those who feel the crushing burden of poverty the most is travelling in a wrong direction.

If a small Socialist party were in Parliament and preached nothing but the doctrines of collective ownership of the land and machinery of production nothing at all would be done towards mitigating existing evils, in fact, if I understand you rightly, nothing else matters, and until the Socialist Government comes along let things go on as they are, as, for instance: working 12 hours a day for £1 a week, children attending school half starved, taxes on food, and the glorious prospect that at some future time you may occupy a place in the workhouse when a pension of about 10/- a week would obviate it.

It must be admitted that remedies for this lamentable state of affairs are very pressing and I for one think it far better and safer to climb the ladder of progress rather than try and leap to the top, which, perhaps, may be very good exercise but accomplishes nothing.

Yours faithfully,

V. WILSON.

UNCOMPROMISING CONSISTENCY.

Dear Sir,—Since I heard a very interesting lecture by Mr. Anderson in Finsbury Park, I have (now and again) been considering the policy of The Socialist Party of Great Britain, and although I have thought myself an out-and-out Socialist for some years, I cannot altogether agree with your doctrines.

I do not love compromises, but I have grown more and more convinced that inconsistent compromises are among the necessary evils of existence.

Nothing in nature is absolute, and it seems impossible that any social or political action can take place that is entirely free from compromise, because no two people could entirely agree as to what is absolutely the best way to promote human welfare.

Then it is, theoretically, impossible for any progress to result from two forces acting in directly opposed directions, unless the party of progress were the stronger. Progress seems to me to be the resultant of the action of different forces which are to some extent inclined towards one another.

This may appear mere fantastic theory to you, at first sight, but really it is merely a way of illustrating a conclusion I had already reached by considering actual experiences.

Another point: the supporting of "palliative" measures. It seems to me that there are cases when it is the obvious duty of every Socialist, and indeed of every kind of humanitarian, to do all they can for such measures. Would it be your policy to refuse to support a measure (on the grounds that it delays the ultimate triumph of Socialism) to better the condition of half-starved children? It seems to me that if you refused to support such measures, because Socialism might be the ultimate gainer by your opposition, you would be offering blood sacrifices to an idea, and so making an idol of Socialism. Of course I do not believe that, in actual fact, you would oppose measures that might be to the obvious present advantage of the workers as a whole; but then why pretend that it is possible to be uncompromisingly consistent?

Finally, you must not think that I think that The Socialist Party of Great Britain is doing

harm; I think it is doing a great deal of good; but only as one of many forces working towards Socialism.—LEONARD J. SIMONS.

With each of our correspondents we find ourselves at least in partial agreement. Thus, for instance, we agree with Mr. Wilson that "Socialism is utterly impossible until the people become Socialists" and therefore

We are making Socialists.

We also agree with Mr. Simons that "Progress" (given the identity of our conceptions of progress) "is the resultant of different forces which are inclined towards one another," and that "it is impossible for any progress to result from two forces acting in directly opposed directions unless the party of progress were the stronger." Precisely. As The Socialist Party we take our stand upon the essential minimum upon which the real interests of all wage-workers are united or inclined towards each other, but these united interests are at the same time directly opposed to those of the capitalist class. Hence on Mr. Simons' own showing no progress can possibly result from any attempt at compromise between two forces in direct antagonism, and that the workers' only hope is to become, as indeed they must, the stronger party. Compromises are, therefore, not only inconsistent—they are utterly futile.

Both correspondents tacitly admit that the evils that cry for palliation are the effects of capitalist exploitation and that in reality Socialism alone is the remedy, yet both, curiously enough, consider reform nostrums of greater importance than Socialism. And this attitude we believe is the result of allowing generous sentiment to usurp the place of reason. Knowledge and reason are of far greater importance than sentimental impulse, and the kindest intentions result in the greatest harm where they override truth and logic.

The whole working class (so named because they do the work for which they get a grudging subsistence) have to produce thrice the amount of wealth they get in wages. Millions of men in this country toil for less than a pound a week. Thousands of women have to slave for wages insufficient to purchase food alone; and many thousands eagerly hunt for employment without success; while as a result of this

Ruthless Exploitation

thousands of children go to school and millions of men and women go to work insufficiently clothed and insufficiently fed. We know this and we are working to end it. Now who is going about it the better way?

We are asked to practically withdraw our energies from what is admittedly the only thing that can put an end to the evils it is sought to palliate and to devote ourselves to inducing the capitalist class to provide meals for school-children and old age pensions. In other words we, and the workers generally, are urged to confine ourselves to begging the ruling class to treat certain of its victims more gently rather than that the workers organise and concentrate upon taking the power to make victims away from the ruling class. But so long as the people confine themselves to crumb begging and do not threaten his supremacy, what more does the capitalist demand?

The class that lives by profit controls the state administratively, judicially and politically, and it is incontestable that any measure of so-called reform that is granted will only go to serve the interests of the ruling class. Thus any miserable measure that may be passed for the feeding of school children would be passed whether we supported or not, while it could only result in paltry soup kitchens for a few—nothing adequate in any sense—and would be used as an instrument for beating down wages. It is indeed futile to oppose such a measure, and no part of our policy, but it is equally futile to abandon work for the removal of the cause in favour of a thing that would not decrease the sum total of working class misery. We seek to own and control collectively the product of our labour, so that our children should not be degraded as profit-producing larvae, but nourished and clothed as they should be.

The old age pension scheme of Mr. Barnes, M.P., Labour misleader, would give the few workers so unfortunate as to survive the age of 65 a pension of 5s. per week, which could only

operate as a bribe to encourage them to starve slowly outside rather than enter the workhouse, where they would be better off. Indeed, whatever paltry pension may ultimately be granted will be to relieve poor rates of the growing burden of the workers who are discharged in favour of younger men, and will also operate like the pensions of soldiers, police, etc., as

A Premium on the Acceptance of Low Wages.

as many workers know to their cost.

Any genuine reform that takes a bite out of capitalist interests (and no reform can be genuine that does not) can only be obtained in opposition to the capitalist class by the workers capturing political power. Thus to obtain even reforms would require what is essentially a revolution. But the working class cannot be united upon a measure that can only doubtfully benefit a small number of them; while the number of evil effects of capitalism is so vast that scarcely any two workers can be united upon all the innumerable palliatives called for, and as to which are the most pressing. By having their attention directed to effects only the efforts of the workers are made mutually antagonistic, and are scattered and nullified by being directed to all points of the compass upon the myriad effects of capitalism, instead of being focussed on the cause.

For the workers to do anything in their interests they must first obtain the power to do it; the next step, therefore, upon which all workers can be united is the capture of political power for the inauguration of industrial democracy. Whether for genuine reform or for Socialism the substitution of working class control for capitalist control—the revolution—is essential, and it alone can stop what is admittedly the cause of misery and poverty—the exploitation of the workers for profit—and can convert the machinery of production from the means of profit for a handful into the means of life and happiness for a people.

To put, as is done in many instances, a long list of "palliatives" before the workers not only excites division and scatters the workers' energies, but leaves the cause of evil unchecked, confines the workers' attention to

Fruitless Efforts at Reform

within the present system, serves capitalist interests and starves and hinders the only forward movement, thus postponing indefinitely both the removal of the cause and the healing of the wounds.

The workers, we believe, can only be united upon broad and elementary fundamental principles, since even transitional measures are conditional on working-class supremacy and can only be determined by the state of industry and the needs of democracy at the revolution. These principles are given in our Declaration of Principles and may be resumed briefly as:—

Firstly: that the poverty and slavery of the workers and all that flows therefrom is due to their robbery by the class owning the means of production and distribution.

Secondly: that to remove the ills under which they labour the workers must themselves own and use collectively the means of producing wealth.

Thirdly: that the workers cannot use or own the political and industrial machinery in their interests or gain any real advantage until they capture the supremacy, therefore the essential step is the revolutionary step, the

Control of Society by the Working Class organised as a class party for Socialism. Upon such essentials the workers as a whole can be united, for all who live by labour stand to gain.

The alternative before us is not, then, as Mr. Wilson would have it, between climbing a ladder and jumping to the top, no metaphor was ever more unfortunate; but the alternative is between marching surely and always toward Socialism as we are doing toward the only remedy by the only road—or marching, as are the reformers, in circles within capitalism with much shouting and capitalist applause but no advance whatever.

Finally, even regarding such inadequate and restricted measures of alleviation that may be possible within the capitalist system, and even supposing the ruling class could be induced to grant them, we direct attention to the following incontrovertible proposition: That the only

effective way to induce the ruling class to do up to palliate the evils of their system is to organise the workers for the overthrow of that system.

TOOTING BRANCH REPORT.

DURING the past six months the Tooting Branch has made greater progress than ever before in its history. Formed three years ago by a little band of six, possessing no speaker of their own and having only one member capable of efficiently acting as chairman, it has in its ranks today five members able to place the principles of Socialism before their fellow workers, in addition to another three who can take the chair.

The result of this development has been, of course, more meetings, and the past six months has seen 63 in and around Tooting; about 45 of which have been carried through by local members without assistance from other branches. So persistent and telling has the propaganda been that the Tories have come out "to expose the fallacies of Socialism." A correspondence in the local *Boro News* has been carried on for several weeks between Mr. Daw, the Conservative agent for Wandsworth, and one of our members on the aforesaid "fallacies," with what result may be judged from Mr. Daw's closing argument here quoted: "He states that our comrade 'asks for evidence to prove that there is some other factor in wealth production than labour power. My answer is, there is to be an exhibition of machinery at Olympia soon; let him go there and use his eyes and powers of observation. He will then perhaps realise the source of the rapid increase in the wealth of labour and capital.' A debate has been arranged between Mr. Daw and Comrade Jackson on 'Is Socialism Practicable.' We have no fear of the result. A debate took place in June between Mr. Bell, a Tariff Reform lecturer, and Comrade Fitzgerald on the respective theories of value of Prof. Jevons and Karl Marx. We do not think that Mr. Bell is anxious for such another grueling. At Streatham a Madhusudan was also met and disposed of in an unimpaired debate.

A record increase of membership was almost inevitable in face of the amount of work done during the past quarter. We are running now, and shall continue to run as long as the weather permits, five meetings a week, two in Tooting and one each in Earlsfield, Streatham and Brockwell Park. A pleasing feature is the increased sale of literature. Bah July and August saw the branch dispose of 30 per cent. more SOCIALIST STANDARDS than ever before, and September has sent the percentage up to 100. The work being done in Earlsfield, Streatham and Brockwell Park will soon show very material results unless we are grossly mistaken.

THE TOOTING, S. BRANCH.

Continued from front page.

either of the candidates before them. But we confess we are not hopeful. The Social Revolution must be preceded by a mental revolution. Much deep study must be undertaken before the mental revolution is accomplished, and until then the workers will fall easy prey to Labour Misleaders like Mr. Hill and his supporters.

J. K.

"If Mr. Hill is defeated," says the *Labour Leader* of September 27th, "he will not be defeated on account of his Socialism, but on account of the identification of Socialism with views which form no part of our Socialist purposes or faith." And, it may be added, if Mr. Hill is successful he will not be successful on account of his Socialism, but on account of the identification of Socialism with views which form no part of the Socialist purpose or faith.

Justice, however, declares it to be a "Socialist" fight. The contest, they say, is "one between Socialism and anti-Socialism." "The fight is distinctly one for and against Socialism, and if Mr. Hill wins it will unquestionably be a Socialist victory." In view of the candidate's program, which Justice admits might be "more pronouncedly Socialist," these words must have come as a severe shock to those S.D.F. members who assert that their organisation is "stifling." It is more flabby than ever.

BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, &c. to be obtained of the S.P.G.B., 22, Great James St., London, E.C.

CAPITAL (Karl Marx) ... 5s. 6d.

WORK AND WAGES (Thorold Rogers) ... 5s. 6d.

POVERTY (Rowntree) ... 4s. 6d.

SOCIALIST STANDARD
Vols. I, II, & III, (Bound) each 3s. 0d.
3 Vols., bound in one ... 5s. 6d.

MANIFESTO OF THE S.P.G.B. ... 1d.

RULES OF THE S.P.G.B. ... 2½d.

S.P.G.B. EMBLEM ... 3d.

FROM HANDICRAFT TO CAPITALISM (Kautsky) 1½d.

ART, LABOUR & SOCIALISM (Morris) 1½d.

ALL POST FREE.

From Handicraft to Capitalism,

Translated from the German of
KARL KAUTSKY.

The only translation in the English language of this important section of the famous "Das Erfurter Program."

POST FREE ... 1½d.

MANIFESTO

OF THE
**Socialist Party
of Great Britain.**

Second Edition, with preface, now ready.

Explains the Party's position towards the S.D.F., I.L.P., Fabian Society, Trade Unions, S.L.P., etc.

Price - One Penny.

Post free 1½d. per copy from the S.P.G.B., 22, Great James Street, London, W.C.
The Trade supplied by Henderson, 16, Paternoster Row, London, E.C.

ART, LABOUR and SOCIALISM.

By **WILLIAM MORRIS.**

Price - One Penny.

Post free 1½d. from the S.P.G.B., 22, Great James Street, London, W.C.

S.P.G.B. LECTURE LIST. OCT., 1907.

SUNDAYS.			6th.			13th.			20th.			27th.		
Battersea, Prince's Head	11.30	H. Newman	T. A. Jackson	F. C. Watts	T. W. Allen									
"	7.30	J. Fitzgerald	T. A. Jackson	E. Fairbrother	J. McManus									
Canning Town, Beckton Rd.	11.30	R. H. Kent	J. Fitzgerald	F. A. Dawkins	W. A. Cole									
Clapham Common	3.30	J. Fitzgerald	E. Fairbrother	T. A. Jackson	H. Newman									
Finchbury Park	7.30	F. E. Dawkins	A. Anderson	J. Fitzgerald	T. A. Jackson									
Fulham, Effie Road	7.30	E. Fairbrother	H. Newman	J. Fitzgerald	J. Crump									
Ilford, Roden Street	8.0	H. Phillips	F. E. Dawkins	W. A. Cole	J. H. Halls									
Jolly Butchers' Hill	11.30	J. H. Halls	R. H. Kent	J. Kent	W. Gifford									
Manor Park Broadway	11.30	W. A. Cole	J. Kent	J. H. Halls	J. Kent									
Paddington, Prince of Wales	11.30	J. Kent	J. H. Halls	J. McManus	T. W. Allen									
Tooting Broadway	7.30	T. A. Jackson	A. Anderson	R. H. Kent	H. Newman									
Tottenham, West Green Cnr.	11.30	A. Anderson	A. Anderson	J. Fitzgerald	F. E. Dawkins									
"	7.30	F. E. Dawkins	A. Anderson	A. Anderson	A. Anderson									
Watford, Market Place	7.30	F. C. Watts	T. W. Allen	J. H. Halls	J. Fitzgerald									
MONDAYS.			7th.			14th.			21st.			28th.		
Ilford, Roden St.	8.30	J. Kent	F. E. Dawkins	W. A. Cole	H. C. Phillips									
WEDNESDAYS.			9th.			16th.			23rd.			30th.		
Highbury Corner	8.30	F. E. Dawkins	T. A. Jackson	F. C. Watts	F. E. Dawkins									
Walham Green Broadway	8.30	E. Fairbrother	H. Newman	J. McManus	T. W. Allen									
THURSDAYS.			10th.			17th.			24th.			31st.		
Tottenham, St. Ann's Road	8.30	A. Anderson	A. Anderson	A. Anderson	A. Anderson									
FRIDAYS.			4th.			11th.			18th.			25th.		
Battersea, Prince's Head	8.30	T. A. Jackson	F. E. Dawkins	T. A. Jackson	E. Fairbrother									
Paddington, Prince of Wales	8.30	F. C. Watts	J. H. Halls	F. C. Watts	T. W. Allen									
Tooting Broadway	8.30	P. Dumenil	J. McManus	H. Newman	P. Dumenil									
SATURDAYS.			5th.			12th.			19th.			26th.		
Walthamstow, Hue St. Station	8.0	A. Anderson	A. W. Pearson	A. Anderson	A. W. Pearson									



THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

No. 39. VOL. 4.]

LONDON, NOVEMBER, 1907.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

PALLIATIVES AND POLITICS.

THE existence of a professing Socialist body with a programme of fifty items of reform may well cause the uninitiated to pause and wonder as to why the Socialist should seek to "capture the political machinery." Presumably it is to legislate and administer the fifty items of reform; and to some members of that organisation that is most certainly the idea. In an argument with a member of the S.D.F. on the question of palliatives, I was met with the astounding statement: "If the S.P.G.B. is not in favour of palliatives there is no occasion for it to go in for political action at all." His "Socialism" prevented him from conceiving political action except for the purpose of administering reforms. Yet the administration of any number of reforms under capitalism is not the work of the Socialist. The S.P.G.B. seeks to attain to political power with the express intention of rendering the administration of reforms and palliatives unnecessary by achieving politically the revolution that will place the means of producing wealth in the hands of the working class.

The two view-points are not only distinct—they are mutually antagonistic. The person who seeks return to political position for the purpose of administering capitalism in a way less objectionable or oppressive to the working class, stands, *ipso facto*, for the maintenance of capitalism. Socialist votes are not necessary to his return and are not, therefore, sought. He stands in the same category as other reformers and his advent to the local council chamber or elsewhere marks no advance in the class consciousness of his electors. But the person who stands for the abolition of capitalism and seeks return to political position for the purpose of using that position to assist in his revolutionary aim, seeks to express the determination of his working-class electors to use the political power in their hands, and stands in a different category. The votes of men not in favour of Socialism are useless to him and are not sought. His election campaign is but an incident in the work of the propaganda of the idea that social reforms are rendered unnecessary when the working class control the industrial machinery which to-day they operate, for the reason that the enjoyment of wealth would follow logically upon its production, and the contradiction of capitalism which couples poverty with industry and wealth with idleness would not be inflicted by the working class upon itself. That contradiction is at the bottom of the demand for and the need for social reform. The Socialist objective is the abolition of the economic relationship which produces it, by the capture of the political machinery and its use for the purpose of that abolition.

The political power is at present gratuitously placed in the hands of the capitalist class, who use it for the maintenance of capitalism. It could as easily be placed by a conscious working class in the hands of its delegates for the purpose of abolishing capitalism.

And no doubt it will be when professing Socialists have themselves recognised the fact, and have ceased to lend their efforts to the capitalist class by agitating for reforms that leave the central position of capitalist domina-

tion intact, and serve but to delay the time when the working class will use its vote for the revolutionary purpose—the Socialist purpose, of ending and not mending capitalism. D.K.

HOW KIRKDALE WAS FOUGHT.

THEY were not responsible for the Kirkdale contest being fought upon Socialism, said Philip Snowden, M.P., at Smethwick on September 28, at an I.L.P. demonstration. No one can accuse the I.L.P. of a desire to fight upon Socialism. And the speeches delivered by Mr. Hill's supporters prove that every effort was made on their side to turn the contest on anything and everything but Socialism. Mr. McPherson, M.P. (Preston), claimed that the Labour men in the House of Commons contained an exceptional proportion of P.S.A. workers and teetotalers. Mr. Stephen Walsh, M.P., asserted that they "would not confiscate the land or rob the landlords, but they would soon be in a position to say to the privileged classes 'So far and no farther,'" a sentiment which met with loud applause. Mr. Will Crooks, M.P., appealed to them as "Ye Christian Men!" and asked them to vote for Mr. Hill because "Christ died to adjust social inequalities." Mr. J. Seddon, M.P., referred to "the notorious fact that almost every member of the Labour Party belonged either to the Established Church or to one of the great bodies of nonconformity." Mr. Arthur Henderson, M.P., stated that the Labour Party contained more religiously inclined persons, and took the pulpit oftener on Sunday than any other section of politicians. What was the real issue, he asked, involved in the contest? It was this: that the electors would declare whether there was endorsement on all of the substantial points of the Government policy. A victory for Labour would show how the people stood, for this Government or against it. The conclusion arrived at would be, that if the Labour Party were defeated it would prove that there was a weakening of the Liberal trend. The Rev. E. F. Forrest (vicar of Pemberton) of the Church Socialist League, wanted Society shaken to its foundations so that "employers and employed might fraternise and class distinctions be abolished." Mr. Philip Snowden, M.P., declared that Tariff Reform was the real crux of the election, and that its adoption would bring about the ruin of the port of Liverpool. Mr. T. F. Richards, M.P., eulogised John Burns. It was just like some working men, he said, to haul down one of their own class. If it was possible for an engineer to be President of the L.G.B., why should not the democracy fill other high offices of State? (Which of the "high offices" is Richards after?) Mrs. Cobden Sanderson (daughter of Richard Cobden) said if her father were alive he would be with her upon that platform. She pleaded for a Free Trade policy and accepted every word of the address of John Hill, "as the aspiration of a true Liberal!" And Mr. J. Ramsay MacDonald explained that the Labour Party did not make Socialism a test for its candidates. We can, therefore, quite agree with Mr. Snowden that they were not responsible for the Kirkdale election being fought upon Socialism. J.K.

Labour Members and Child Slavery.

WHEN is the case of the sweated children and "half timers" in the textile industries to be taken up by the Labour Group in Parliament? asks *Reynolds' Newspaper*. For years, it says, the Radical Democrats have been trying to secure better conditions for these little slaves of industry, and to some extent have succeeded. But surely, after the resolution passed at the recent Trade Union Congress, there is a special duty upon the Labour party to see that something further is done in this direction in the next Session of Parliament?

Reynolds is too optimistic if it thinks that the present Labour Party will do anything in this direction. Mr. David Shackleton and Mr. Gill, members respectively for Clitheroe and Bolton, have already expressed themselves against any action being taken. As they explained at the Belfast Conference of the Labour Party, if it were insisted that they should initiate or support legislation with this object, they would lose their seats and the societies they represented would withdraw from the Labour Party and this would involve the withdrawal of their payment of £900 a year to the Labour Party funds. But, we are told by some of our enthusiastic I.L.P. friends, the "Socialist" members of the Party will take the lead in the House of Commons, and the Shackletons and Gills will have to follow, and they call attention to clause 5 of the I.L.P. programme, "The raising of the age of child labour, with a view to its ultimate extinction." But the I.L.P. members of Parliament are not bound by the Party's programme, as witness the manner in which they threw it over at Kirkdale. And now Mr. James Parker, M.P. for Halifax, and member of the National Administrative Council of the I.L.P., expresses his views. Lecturing at Burton-on-Trent on October 7th, on "Socialism and the Children," he declared his belief in the children of the poor people having a free breakfast. "Indeed," he said, "I believe that every child should have one meal a day at school." He also advocated that they should sit together and be medically inspected. In what way these views touched Socialism he omitted to state, probably because he knew that they had nothing to do with Socialism at all. Neither did he outline the position of the children under Socialism. At the conclusion of his lecture he was asked whether a Bill was to be introduced during the next Parliamentary Session to raise the age at which a child could go to work. Mr. Parker replied that he did not know. He and other members of the I.L.P. favoured such a step, but as many of them represented such manufacturing centres as Halifax and Leeds, they would have to vote for their constituents and against such a course. Thus Mr. Parker, having thrown over "political independence" and made a compact with the Liberal Party to secure election, now shows himself prepared to throw over anything else that may endanger his seat. We wish the I.L.P. joy of these "political job hunters." J.K.

We regret to announce that our Comrade Ferdinand Czilinsky, of the Tottenham branch, died on September 20th after an illness of three days. Our comrade was seventy-two years of age.

[CONTINUED FROM OCTOBER ISSUE.]

THE PROLETARIAT

(The Working Class).

By KARL KAUTSKY.

Specially translated for The Socialist Party of Great Britain and approved by the Author.

5. THE INDUSTRIAL RESERVE ARMY.

The introduction of the labour of women and children into industry is, as we have seen, one of the most powerful means for forcing down wages.

But at times other means have an equally powerful effect; the importation of workers from localities backward in economic development, where the population have but few wants, but possess labour-power that has not yet fallen under the ban of industrial enterprise. The development of large industrial enterprise, especially of machinery, not only makes it possible to use unskilled in place of skilled workers, but also affords the opportunity of obtaining them cheaply and quickly. Development of the methods of transit proceeds hand in hand with the development of production; transit on a large scale develops side by side with production on a large scale, transit not only of commodities but of persons. Steamships and railways, these highly praised bearers of culture, not only carry rifles, whisky, and syphilis to the Barbarians, but they also bring the Barbarians to us and with them their Barbarism. The migration of agricultural labourers into the towns is assisted by this development; and from ever greater distances swarm the persevering masses, who have but few needs and little power of resistance. Slaves, Swedes, and Italians go to Germany and drag down wages; Germans, Belgians, and Italians go to France; Slaves, Germans, Italians, Irishmen and Swedes to England and the United States; Chinamen to America and Australia, and perhaps in the not too distant future also to Europe. On German ships Chinamen and Negroes are already taking the places of white workers.

These foreign workers are, partly, expropriated small peasants and petty bourgeois, who have been ruined and driven from hearth and home by the capitalist mode of production. Gazing at the numberless crowds of emigrants we may well ask the question whether it is Socialism that thus makes them homeless and is responsible for men and women leaving their native land.

By expropriating small peasants and petty bourgeois, by importing crowds of workers from distant countries, by the development of woman- and child-labour, by shortening the term of apprenticeship which becomes merely a period of initiation, the capitalist mode of production effects an enormous increase in the number of workers at its disposal. Hand in hand with this increase proceeds the ever growing productivity of human labour in consequence of the uninterrupted progress in technical improvements and inventions. And not alone this: but capitalist exploitation increases also the power of utilising the labour-power of the individual to the utmost degree, partly through extending the hours of labour, but also by speeding up the workers, especially in those cases where the organisation of the workers or legislation prevents the former course being pursued.

And at the same time machinery has the effect of reducing the amount of manual labour required. Every machine displaces labour; if that were not so there would be nothing gained in having the machine. In every industry the change from manual labour to production by machinery causes the greatest suffering among the manual workers affected, who, whether they be handicraftsmen or factory workers, become redundant, and are turned into the street. It was this effect of the machine which the workers felt first of all. The numerous instances of revolt in the first decades of the nineteenth century showed the great suffering and despair which were caused by the introduction of machinery. The introduction of machinery, and every subsequent improvement thereof, is always detrimental to the interests of certain sections of the workers: sometimes, of course, other sections may benefit—as, for instance, those employed in the engineering trade. But this knowledge will hardly be a consolation to the displaced workers faced with starvation.

The effect of the introduction of every new machine is that as much as before is produced with fewer workers, or more than before with the same number of workers. If, therefore, the number of workers employed in one country is not to diminish in consequence of the growing development of machinery, then the market must be extended in the same proportion in which the productivity of labour increases. As, however, economic development causes at the same time the quantity of labour performed by the worker to grow and the available labour-power to increase rapidly—and much more rapidly than the population—it is necessary, if unemployment is to be avoided, that the market be extended much more rapidly than in a ratio that would merely keep pace with the growing productivity of the workers owing to the introduction of machinery.

Such a rapid expansion of the market has scarcely ever taken place under the domination of capitalist industry on a large scale, certainly never for any considerable period in a large field of capitalist industry. Hence, unemployment is a permanent feature of capitalist industry on a large scale, the one being inseparable from the other. Even at brisk periods, when the market experiences important extension and trade is flourishing, industry has not room for all the unemployed. In periods of slackness, when trade is dull, their number grows immensely. They, together with the workers of the superfluous petty undertakings, form

a whole army—the Industrial Reserve Army, as Marx called it—an army of labourers always at the disposal of capital, from which the latter is always able to draw its reserves as soon as the industrial struggle shows signs of becoming animated.

The reserve army is invaluable to the capitalist. It serves him as an important weapon to keep in check the army of the employed and to make them more submissive. Since the overwork of some causes the unemployment of others, the unemployment of these latter becomes the means for sustaining and intensifying the overwork of the former. And yet in face of this fact it is asserted that we are living in the best of all possible worlds!

While the expansion of the industrial reserve army fluctuates with the fluctuations of commercial life, its general tendency is to move in an upward direction; for the technical revolution proceeds ever more rapidly, extending continually to wider spheres, but the expansion of the market on the contrary becomes ever more limited. We shall have occasion to refer to this point again in another connection. It suffices here to have drawn attention to it.

But what does unemployment mean? It not only means want and misery for its victims, not only intensified slavery and exploitation for those in employment, but it means also insecurity of existence for the entire working class.

Whatever the fate of those exploited under former systems of exploitation may have been, they were certain of one thing—security of livelihood. The sustenance of the slave or the serf was assured at least for so long as the existence of his master was secure. Only the ruin of his master could deprive him of his security of livelihood.

The misery or want that under any former mode of production was at times experienced by the population was not the consequence of production, but a disturbance of production through bad harvests, cattle plague, floods, invasion by hostile armies, etc.

The existence of the exploiter is not bound up with that of the exploited. The worker and his wife and children can at any moment be turned into the street, with starvation staring them in the face, without causing the slightest change in the position of the exploiter who has fattened on him.

And the misery of unemployment is to-day rarely the consequence of disturbances in production through external, overpowering influences, it is now in fact the natural consequence of production itself. Disturbances in production under present conditions often increase the opportunities for work instead of lessening them: one need only call to mind the consequences of the war in 1870 to the economic life of Germany and France during the immediately succeeding years.

Under the domination of petty enterprise the income of the worker producing on his own account grew larger the more industrious he proved to be. Laziness ruined him and caused his unemployment. To-day the longer the workers work the more unemployment increases. The worker causes his unemployment by his own work. Like many another maxim from the world of petty enterprise, the one that the workers good fortune depends upon his being industrious has been changed to its opposite by the large capitalist enterprise. And another maxim still mouthed to-day by many a Philistine, presumably for the benefit of the worker, has become an untruth, namely, that anyone willing to work can find work.

Just as little as a small property is a sure protection against want and misery so is possession of labour-power. While the ghost of bankruptcy is continually hovering over the peasant owner and the handicraftsman, the ghost of unemployment haunts the wage-worker all his life.

This continual insecurity is of all the evils of the present mode of production the most tormenting, and also the most atrocious, the evil that stirs up the feeling of the worker unspeakably and scatters completely to the winds all his conservative notions. This eternal insecurity of his own position undermines his belief in the security of the existing state of things and extinguishes his interest in its retention. And he who continually dreads the existing state of things finally loses all fear for new conditions.

The capitalist mode of production brings in its train overwork, unemployment, and dissolution of the family for the working-class, and it has at the same time the effect of forcing proletarian conditions upon further sections of Society, thus visibly making these conditions the general conditions of the great mass of the population.

INVENTORS AS TRUST HIRELINGS.

"The applications for patents come mainly from professional inventors. The largest number of applications come from the great trusts—the United States Steel Company, the great electrical companies, the harvester trust and the automobile trust. These trusts employ hundreds of inventors to devise improvements of their machinery. They are paid large salaries in many instances, and the business is gradually falling almost completely into their hands.

Report of Asst. Commissioner of Patents, U.S.A., 1907.

ANOTHER SOLUTION THAT WON'T SOLVE.

"The Railway Difficulty and How to Solve It" is a penny pamphlet by Thomas Johnson and Hugh Adam. The writers advocate Nationalisation as immediately practicable. But they assert that it would mean a saving of at least 20 per cent. in working expenses. In other words, the Nationalisation of Railways would intensify the unemployed problem, as Mr. Bell, M.P., pointed out at the Annual General Meeting of the A.S.R.S. The authors claim to be "unhesitatingly and uncompromisingly Socialist," and in their conclusion admit that Nationalisation of Railways would not be of any avail, but we must have Socialism. Why, then, waste the time and fritter away the energies of the working class in going for something that will not affect their position as the subject class in the community?

A LOOK ROUND.

Writing in the *Sportsman* for October 14th, "Vigilant," oppressed by a dread that "Sport would go by the board were the Socialists ever to take charge," says that what is wanted is that men with big incomes not derived from land should come into the swim and assist the projected movement. It is really, he says, an insurance proposal, if they would only understand.

The "insurance proposal" emanates from Epsom. It is "a practical scheme for not merely opposing the pernicious doctrines of Socialism, but with further suggestions for providing agricultural employment and enabling the labourers to share in profits."

Why should "Vigilant" be afraid that "sport" will be non-existent under Socialism? In the old English definitions sport was a game, pastime, or amusement, a play, a diversion, a merry-making, a frolic. The word was also used to describe collectively such out-of-door recreations as grown men indulged in, more especially hunting, fishing, racing, shooting, and the like. It was likewise a comprehensive term embracing all forms of athletics and games of skill in which prizes were competed for. There is, therefore, no reason to suppose that, under Socialism, sport will be taboo. On the contrary, there is every reason to believe that it will flourish as it has never done before.

Of course, sport has been prostituted under capitalism, like most other things. "Sports" (mainly of the Hebrew persuasion) have entered the arena and have fastened themselves on to sport for profit-making purposes. They regard sport as a legitimate Tom Tiddler's ground, and speculate in it in the same way as the jobber makes a "book" on stocks or the Mining Lane merchant speculates on the price of petroleum months ahead. These gentry will be unable to play the game under Socialism, and will not need to, because Socialism will provide enough and to spare for all—will establish the Right to Live. The only condition will be that those who desire to live shall recognise and fulfil their obligation to do their share of the necessary work, and as this will be reduced to a minimum and will be joyous and health-giving; as all will have leisure and opportunity for mental and physical development of the highest order, sport, in its truest sense, will no longer be prostituted, but will form part and parcel of the daily life of the people.

"I write" adds "Vigilant," because "I know how racing would suffer under socialistic schemes." But he knows nothing about it. There is no reason at all why racing should not exist under Socialism, but it will not be subverted to suit the purposes of men of the make, who regard it to-day, not from the point of view of sport, but as a means whereby the "ready" may be transferred from others' pockets into theirs.

What should be noticed in particular is the appeal to the sporting fraternity to join with the opponents of Socialism in their efforts to fight Socialism by palliating capitalism. When the S.P.G.B. has pointed out to misguided members of the S.D.F. and I.L.P. that as palliatives tend to perpetuate capitalism they should not be advocated by Socialists; that the master class would vie with each other to pass laws "to improve the condition of the working class" when they really believed the latter were accepting the principles of Socialism, its members have been denounced as "wreckers," "impossibilists," etc., whereas, as a matter of fact, it is the advocate of palliatives, the striver after reforms, who is the real impossibilist, and is side-tracking the working-class movement. Now that this position is being proved by the defenders of capitalism, is it too much to hope that the aforementioned misguided S.D.F. and I.L.P. members will be honest enough and brave enough to "come out from among them"?

and join the only Socialist party in this country, —the S.P.G.B.?

The apologies of the "palliators" are amusing. A prominent member of the I.L.P. recently took the platform in Manchester in opposition to an S.P.G.B. lecturer and asserted that owing to their lack of education and to their chronic underfeeding and bad housing the working class cannot understand Socialism and it is therefore necessary to work for palliatives in order to fit them to understand it. That, of course, was an admission that one of the charges brought against the I.L.P. by the S.P.G.B., viz., that it does not preach Socialism, is justified. But as the I.L.P. does not preach Socialism, how can it know whether the working class can understand it or not?

Moreover, if it is necessary to give the working class better conditions so that they may understand and accept Socialism, districts such as Port Sunlight and Bournville should be hotbeds of Socialist agitation. But are they? It is just as illogical to assert that revolutionists can only be made out of a well-fed people as it is to say that they can only be made out of a starving people.

"Education and an empty belly are the raw materials of revolution" writes "Vancor" in the *Referee* for to-day (Oct. 20th). I think this as near to the truth as one can get because education is put first. It is not imperative that the individual should have both the education and the empty belly. It cannot be questioned that an increasing number of the wage-earners, amongst the rising generation in particular, are seizing every opportunity to widen their mental outlook, as is evidenced by the enormous demand for scientific (which, of course, includes economic) and classical literature now prevalent, and by their attendance at public meetings, lectures, and debates. (There is a lesson here which the publicans might learn with advantage, as some few have already done, instead of wasting their time bawling the emptiness of their unattractive, seatless, sawdust-floored horse-boxes, and cursing the clubs). The wage-earners are therefore obtaining education of the real kind, and capitalist development, with its facilities for disseminating information relative to industrial conditions all over the world, and its production of empty bellies in increasing numbers, is doing the rest. Education is enabling the wage-workers who are in employment to recognise that a very slender partition separates them from their "empty-belly" confreres.

When a sufficient number have educated themselves, when a mental revolution has been accomplished, the way will have been prepared for the social revolution that shall end the struggle for existence between man and man, and relieve human beings of the fear that oppresses the majority of them under capitalism, viz. that at any moment they may be, through no fault of their own, thrown on to the industrial scrap heap or forced into that flotsam and jetsam of humanity which one can observe running to seed day by day.

The secretary of the Liberty and Property Defence League writes to the Press from 25, Victoria Street, Westminster, that twelve months ago the League published a sixpenny volume of papers entitled "Socialism: Its Fallacies and Dangers" in which every phase of Socialism—economic, social, and political—is discussed by writers who have made the subject the study of their lives. They have two new pamphlets in the Press: "The Socialist Spectre" and "The Impossibility of Socialism."

What a lot of noise over a spook and a thing that cannot be! But, as the poet says: "Such tricks hath strong imagination. That, if it would apprehend some joy, It comprehends some bringer of that joy; Or, in the night, imagining some fear, How easy is a bush supposed a bear!"

Speaking at a meeting of Liberal Registra-

tion Agents at Aberdeen on October 1st, Mr. D. A. Thomas, M.P., suggested that if the I.L.P. would help the Welsh nonconformists in their fight for religious liberty (whatever that is), he would help them to oppose candidates "of the Whig or neo-Tory type who attempted to sail under the Liberal flag." In view of Keir Hardie's tactics when he contested Merthyr and the facility with which I.L.P. atheists became Christians during the Kirkdale election, the deal proposed by Mr. Thomas should appeal to them "in once."

At a meeting held at Manchester on October 5th, under the auspices of the Ancoats Healthy Homes Society, Mr. J. Grime said the Medical Officer of Health had reported that during the past two or three years no other part of the city had improved so much as Ancoats (possibly no other part needed it so much). Where the people lived and worked, he said, were the important parts of the city to be cared for.

That's a good capitalist dictum, and one in which Sir John Gorst, among others, firmly believes. He supports the S.D.F. agitation for free meals in order to make more efficient profit producing workers.

Commenting on Mr. Keir Hardie's visit to Bengal, the *Statesman* (India) says the fact that Mr. Hardie was the guest of the Maharajah of Mysenagh disposes of the suggestion that he has been guilty of anything serious. Apparently, the *Statesman* thinks that a man will not speak ill of you after having fed at your expense. Is the same view held by English Liberal and Tory M.P.'s who invite Labour members to banquets?

Mr. Herbert Burrows, of the S.D.F., will contest the Parliamentary division of Haggerston at the next election providing the present Liberal member is not a candidate. Thus the S.D.F. again shows that while it professes to be equally opposed to Liberal and Tory, it really believes there is a difference between the two, a difference in favour of the Liberal, whom it therefore refuses to oppose.

"It is a good thing for employers," said the *Daily Chronicle* on October 9th, "that Labour should be organised, for organisation tends to promote a higher sense of responsibility. That truth is so obvious that in France the Socialists for whom M. Hervé and M. Jaurès speak, deprecate the formation of strong trade unions on the ground that by their very strength and wealth they operate as a restraint on rashness, and tend always to be pacific."

The last stage of democratic evolution has generally been a conflict between the Haves and Have Nots, and to this goal democracy seems to be moving slowly in England, in France, and in the United States.—*Daily Mail*, Oct. 5th.

What the country wants is a more proportionate representation of organised labour—not a revolution.—Mr. GRAYSON, M.P., at Liverpool, Oct. 6th.

The pioneers of the co-operative movement, in trying to reconcile capital and labour, were dealing with the root cause of social evils and inequalities.—Mr. SNOWDEN, M.P., at Birmingham, Sept. 28th.

A teetotaler is an infinitely better man than even a moderate drinker, physically, morally, and intellectually.—Mr. H. QUENCH at Luton, October 2nd.

J. KAY.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

A.B. (Portsmouth).—No, we do not get tired of criticising the individuals you name—it is one of the things we exist for.

L. Bourne.—As you say, the conducting of this paper is a matter for the Party members, still we welcome both criticism and suggestions, and will have an article prepared on matter you mention.

E. Elliot.—At some future date.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, subscriptions for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, articles, correspondence and advertisements submitted for insertion therein should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 22, Great James Street, London, W.C., to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD is published on the first day in each month.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office every Tuesday at 7 p.m.

Terms of Subscriptions.

UNITED KINGDOM.		
Twelve Months	...	1s. 6d.
Six Months	...	9d.
AMERICA.		
Twelve Months	...	50 cents.
Six Months	...	25 cents.

The Socialist Standard.

FRIDAY, NOV. 1, 1907.



A Confession of Impotence.

SPEAKING for the S.D.F. at N.E. Manchester on September 28th, Mr. J. R. Clynes, M.P., thus delivered himself amid, we read, loud S.D.F. cheers:—

The Labour Party in Parliament were doing their best. He thought they should be delegates to carry out the will of the people who sent them there. They only represented a small minority of the workers and could not speak for the whole of the workers. They were told to kick up a row and make themselves a nuisance like the Irish Party. But the Irish Party had nearly the whole of Ireland behind them.

That comes of being a fierce democrat and the bosom chum of an implacable revolutionary like Bill Thorne. Having fulfilled the first of their desires and "got in" on programmes that, whatever else they may have been, were distinctly *not* Socialist; and having discovered that being in on such terms they were, as we said they would and must be, impotent, the LABOUR-SOCIALIST members now seek to placate the wrath of any of their "advanced" friends by pointing out that they couldn't kick up a row because, don't y'see, they haven't the whole people behind them. As unflinching democrats, it was their business first and foremost (after "getting in") to carry out the will of the people by whose votes they were returned, and as these votes were not given for Socialism, naturally they (the elected persons) couldn't act as Socialists or preach Socialism.

The thing is as plain as can be. We can't, they say, run on a Socialist programme because the people, the sovereign people (two hundred sovereigns to be precise), are not Socialists and wouldn't elect us; we can't voice Socialism when we are elected because we must represent the views of our constituents. Of course Socialism is the only thing that materially matters to the workers ("I believe and recognise the class war," says Clynes), and when the people are Socialists we shall—my word! how we shall go for the capitalists, and what a row we shall kick up. But until then—And so on, and so on.

Exploiters of Sentiment.

Well, what is the use of Clynes & Co. from a Socialist point of view at all? And what is the use of the S.D.F. "Socialists" in Manchester who cheered Clynes and moved him votes of thanks? If Clynes is prepared, as in common with other members of the Labour Group who claim to be Socialists he certainly is, to subordinate Socialism, the admittedly only hope of the workers, to the chance of "getting in," what use is he from a working-class standpoint? He may claim that he did not know how important his precious "Labour" party would be. He may have been, as many professing Socialists are, under the impression that the great thing is to "get in," and then use your position as a sounding board for your principles—play the political fraud, deceive the electorate, prepare the way for a Socialism that is impossible without an educated working class by deliberately

hoodwinking that class! We have set our faces against this, the fairly common practice of the S.D.F., I.L.P. and other pseudo-Socialist parties, and earned for ourselves by our denunciations, the epithet "impossibilists." But this damnable doctrine of doing evil that good may come was, and is yet, widely held, and Clynes may have been innoculated with it.

Assume that he was an honest fool then as against a worse assumption, and went in with high hopes of better work possible under the changed conditions only to find he was tied hand and foot and delivered bound to the "Labour Party." Assuming that, what would his position be provided he remained honest? What action would he take? Surely he would risk his salary, break with the "Labour" Party and its restrictions, and shout his Socialism from the Parliamentary house-top. Such action would not, of course, purge the evil of his election, but it would be evidence of honest stupidity.

But what if instead of this he swallowed his aspirations, pocketed his wages and came along with the explanation that, after all you cannot work in advance of your electorate? Well, in that case you would know to a very nice exactitude what the price of that man was.

Mark! this is the case of a man who started into office foolish but honest. But suppose the best of evidence existed to show that he had no delusions as to his powers when he "got in," that knowing all the time that Socialism was the only thing that mattered to the workers, he deliberately whittled his policy and submerged his principles until he made himself acceptable to the ignorance of a number of electors sufficiently large for his purposes; what would then be said when that man came along to explain his impotence on the ground of the ignorance of the electorate? What would we call a man who, while occupying the standing of a leader in professing Socialist circles, deliberately got himself elected on a non-Socialist programme that rendered him entirely useless to the working class, and who then came to his professing Socialist supporters to explain that he was useless because he had been elected on a non-Socialist ticket?

Think it over, my friends of North East Manchester and elsewhere, remembering the speech of J. R. Clynes, M.P. And do not forget the loud cheers of his S.D.F. supporters. They at any rate are prepared to be parties to the same game again—if the Manchester S.P.G.B. does not interfere. However, as there is a branch of the S.P.G.B. in Manchester now, the local confusionists can rely upon the interference, as we can rely upon our comrades making that interference effective.

The Only Socialist Party.

Many comments have been penned by writers in the official organs of bodies claiming to be Socialist to whom the S.P.G.B. is in open and avowed antagonism because of the resolution passed by the E.C. of the S.P.G.B., challenging the British Constitution Association to debate the principles of Socialism. The aforesaid writers are concerned owing to the resolution describing the S.P.G.B. as "the only Socialist Party in this country." Well, seeing that it is, why should not the fact be announced? What is it that differentiates the S.P.G.B. from other parties claiming to be Socialist? It is the *only* party that, from its formation and ever since, has advocated Socialism, and nothing short of Socialism, at all times and under all conditions. It is the only party that has declined to be side-tracked or to assist in side-tracking the people by concentrating their efforts upon the palliation instead of upon the abolition of capitalism. It is the only party that has refused to attach itself to freak organisations, political or industrial. It is assailed because it declines to advocate palliatives. But what have the opponents of Socialism been declaring recently is the best way to fight Socialism? To palliate the evils of capitalism! Mr. Levy Lever, M.P., says Socialism must be fought "by legislation dealing with housing, social, and land reform, and old age pensions." Lord Burghelere declares for "Social Legislation." Sir George Kekewich, M.P., says "Employ the unemployed. Reform the Poor Law. House the Workers. Pension the Aged." The Marquis of Northampton is of opinion that the

discontent of the working class is owing to the lethargy of successive Governments as regards drastic social reforms. Sir H. Seymour King, M.P., would fight it by granting the legitimate demands of the masses for improved conditions and opportunities. The Hon. Claude Hay, who has supported the S.D.F., financially and otherwise, in their agitation for free meals for school-children, plumps for "bold social reforms," and others would "give the poorer classes a stake in the country," thereby admitting, of course, that they possess none at present. But all these proposals are put forward, let it not be forgotten, by those who are out to fight Socialism. And it is these same antidotes to Socialism that the S.D.F., I.L.P., and similar reform bodies are urging the workers to scramble for! The S.P.G.B., comprehending the real significance of the working-class movement, declines to be side-tracked. It knows that only Socialism will give the wealth producers their freedom and the wealth they produce, and it is therefore out for Socialism all along the line, and has always been. No other party in this country can substantiate a similar claim and therefore the S.P.G.B. is justified in describing itself as "the only Socialist Party."

A TRAVESTY OF SOCIALISM.

UNDOUBTEDLY one of the greatest hindrances to a clear understanding of Socialism is the misrepresentation to which it is subject, not only from opponents, but also from those who, at times, call themselves Socialists. Here, for example, is Mr. Jas. Parker, Labour M.P. for Halifax, which position he secured by making a compact with the Liberal Party, assuring an audience at Swadlincote Town Hall (on October 8th) that the Army, Navy, and Post Office are Socialistic institutions, and that the last Government decided to socialise the telephones. Did anyone ever hear such twaddle? What is Socialism? It is the ownership and control by all the people of all the means of production and distribution of wealth. It is thus the very antithesis of capitalism. How, then, can you have Socialistic institutions in the midst of capitalism? The Army and the Navy exist for the purpose of protecting the British capitalist class against the capitalist class of other countries and to enable them to extend their spheres of exploitation. Yet these according to our I.L.P. oracle, are Socialistic! And the Post Office is admittedly an institution where the lower grade of workers are abominably sweated in order to provide a huge profit, which the P.M.G. (Tory or Liberal) may apply to the reduction of taxation. And as taxes do not affect the working class in the least, as their exploitation takes place in the factory—they are robbed at the pay-box—a fact which even Mr. Victor Grayson has not yet grasped! what does it matter to them whether taxes are high or low? There is all the difference in the world between State Capitalism and Socialism. In the former the members of the working class are still wage-slaves, even tho' their conditions may be better than under Private Capitalism, but, as has been proved by recent events at Woolwich, the fear of dismissal always hangs over their heads. In the latter, all will be workers, owning and controlling all the wealth-producing implements that they operate. They will no longer be slaves, subject to be condemned to semi-starvation at the whim or caprice of a master, but free men and free women performing their share of the necessary work and enjoying, as only a free people can enjoy, the good things of life that they co-operate to produce. To argue that certain capitalist institutions are Socialist ones is misleading and those who so argue are either ignorant or fraudulent.

"Art, Labour, and Socialism" should sell well. It can be obtained by branches and other bodies in the ordinary way on the usual terms: 9d. per 13. Half gross orders carriage paid.

Order THE SOCIALIST STANDARD through your local newsagent. If you have any difficulty in obtaining it regularly please communicate with the S.P.G.B., 22, Gt. James St., London, W.C.

TRADE UNIONISM.

A DEBATE.

To save repetition and for convenience of reference we have numbered the paragraphs in the reply of the Advocates, and will answer under those numbers.

REPLY OF ADVOCATES.

The loose and inaccurate habit of thought of the S.P.G.B. is well typified by the sub-heading of their answer, which attempts to make out that the present debate is with the S.L.P. instead of with the A. of I.U.

(1) When we speak of the S.P.G.B. wandering away from the correct position, it is in the sense that they totally fail to put into practice the principle expressed in their Manifesto, "that the basis of the trade unions must be a clear recognition of the worker's position under capitalism and the class struggle resulting therefrom," by advocating the formation of such a union in Great Britain. Instead they deliberately attack those who are seeking to establish an industrial union based on the class struggle, aiming at the overthrow of the capitalist system and the establishment of the Socialist Republic.

(2) The S.P.G.B., after publishing in its official organ the statement that "we Socialists want to see industrial unionism," reject another later article because it asks for the same thing. For the S.P. to contend that a union could not be a class union, that is, based on the class struggle, because it would be organised according to industries, cuts the ground from under their own feet, for if economic grouping in an economic body robs it of its class character, then geographical grouping in a political body must do likewise.

(3) There is no jumble of unions in our organisation. Our object is to organise the workers in a compact body along the same lines in which modern industrial conditions compel them to work together, that is united according to industrial, and not divided along craft lines. The object of our union is the taking over by and for the workers themselves the productive forces they now operate for a boss. Anyone knows that the General Federation of Trade Unions is simply out to federate the existing craft unions, duplicates as well, leaving their internal organisation absolutely intact. What we are out for is to organise one union of the whole working class, divided for administrative and other purposes into industrial departments and local industrial unions, just as an army is divided into regiments or a political party into local branches.

(4) The I.W.W. of America, in spite of the alleged split (a split only in the sense that the fakirs were kicked out) has now over 28,000 fully paying members. Several European countries, France, Roumania, Bulgaria, Italy, Germany, etc., have unions organised on industrial lines, both before and since the I.W.W. was started, and now Australia is starting an industrial union, with the title, preamble and constitution of the I.W.W.—facts which prove the efficiency of revolutionary industrial organisation.

(5) To say that because we wish an economic organisation as being the chief means to overthrow capitalism and to form the foundation of the Socialist Republic, that we are Anarchist as believing in direct action, places the loyal S.P.ite in the same category should he become involved in a strike and should he not attempt to conduct it through the ballot box.

(6) We claim that were the working class organised in a revolutionary industrial union, we could prevent to a large extent the use of armed forces against the workers. Transport, food, clothing, ammunition, etc., are necessary factors in warfare, and the workers industrially organised could prevent the hired assassins of the capitalist class from using them. In the railway strike in Italy the Government used armed force to compel the men to run certain trains, but the organised workers in Milan and elsewhere called a series of strikes in these towns which made the Government withdraw the troops and grant the workers' demands.

(7) If the revolution is to be effected by armed force, how are the workers going to get it because if the capitalists can prevent the organ-

ising of a revolutionary union because of their strict supervision, are we to suppose they will allow an armed force to be got together? And if they did, how are workers ever to obtain sufficient wealth to purchase "the modern weapons of precision and death-dealing?"

(8) Although the capitalists could not starve the industrially organised workers into submission, seeing we will have possession of the means of production, what would there be to prevent them starving a "Socialist" government out of power by refusing to give up control of the fighting forces and the means of production to the Socialist M.P.'s?

(9) To say that the capitalist class laid the foundation of their control by building up an army under Cromwell and Fairfax begs the question as to how they got control of this army, which we contend was only by the capitalists having since the time of Henry 8th been developing and getting economic power, thereby being able to purchase the munitions of war, pay their soldiers, etc., when the question of feudal or capitalist supremacy finally became relegated from Parliament to battlefield.

(10) We were wrong in describing the S.P. as "neutral," for to actively oppose, as they do, those who are attempting to organise a union "based on the class struggle, aiming at the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of the Socialist Republic," amounts to backing up the existing reactionary trade unions. To say that Allen's article was allowed in because it asked for a Socialist union when it stated "we Socialists want to see industrial unionism," and to reject a second article because it asked for the same thing, is equal to saying that a union "based on the class struggle," etc., is not a Socialist union.

(11) The statement that Kent's resolution did not say an industrial organisation "affiliated to and controlled by the S.P.G.B." is a distinct suggestion of falsification. The facts are that these words were added to Kent's resolution as an amendment by Anderson. The resolution as amended was carried, and Kent himself voted for it. If the S.P. a titule is not one of "boring from within" when it allows its members to hold office in existing unions that deny the class struggle, thus helping to build them up and extend their influence, we should like to know what is. They have some members who have denied the need for economic organisation at all.

(12) With regard to the I.W.W. excluding men on account of high dues, when first established the Executive Board had power to lower and forgive them if it so wished. The S.P. likewise conveniently overlooks the differences in the money rate of wages in America and here. Since Sherman & Co. were kicked out, the I.W.W. has organised men who were on strike without the payment of initiation fee or dues. The Paterson silk workers had their dues reduced 25 per cent., and they won their strike. In their official organ for July 27th, '07 they report the winning of the Paterson Locomotive Workers' strike, and in the same issue report Local 95 as exempted from paying assessments. Bridgeport I.W.W. machinists won their strike. The big strike in the mills of Skowhegan was won by the I.W.W. Case after case can be given proving it a lie to say that the I.W.W. has never won a strike, and also that it makes dues and initiation fees so high as to keep workers out. In Schenectady the I.W.W. had only 3,000 men: the rest of the 12,000 in the Works were in craft unions, and it was these remaining at work blacklegging on the I.W.W. that lost the strike. In Buffalo several new unions have been started. The I.W.W. has won more strikes than it has lost. Even if it had not, it does not prove industrial unionism wrong, because anyone with sense knows a union must have a certain proportion of workers inside to strike successfully; while young and weak some strikes are sure to be lost. The S.P.G.B. has never won an election, therefore it is a fraud.

(13) With regard to the split, the S.P. should be the last to talk of splits seeing that it is simply the result of a split from the S.D.F. itself, and has since had splits at Islington and elsewhere in its own ranks.

(14) We attend workers political bodies, trade union branches, trades councils, etc., at their invitation just as the S.P.G.B. was prepared to let Lehané go to the Parliament branch I.L.L. when there was a chance to go. To drag in the

S.L.P. is quite irrelevant as this is a debate with the A. of I.U. and not the S.L.P. The S.P.G.B. allows its members to hold office in unions that deny the class struggle, that are going to moralise the capitalists like the O.B.S., establish mutual relations between employer and employee, and that are affiliated to the bogus Labour Party which is supposed to be fought by the S.P. If industrial unionism is so bad and against Socialist principles why does the S.P.G.B. fail to tell us the methods on which a union should be organised, and then set about organising it to prove their honesty?

S.P.G.B. ANSWER TO ADVOCATES.

(1) Both on the platform and in our paper we continually point out to the working class the necessity for political and economic action and for building up their organisations from their class basis. To call a new organisation an "industrial" union merely conveys to the average worker the idea of a union similar in most respects to the existing unions and differing only in some details. Call it a "Socialist" union and attention is at once directed to the fundamental differences between that and the present unions. If the Advocates are in favour of a Socialist union why do they attempt to start unions that sectionalise the workers according to industry and then try to hide their stupidity by saying that this sectionalism is on a class basis?

(2) As people usually live in different localities, geographical subdivision of organisation becomes necessary, and the I.W.W. has been compelled to adopt this form despite their denouncing this method as wrong. The S.P. is an organisation with geographical sub-divisions, but the I.W.W. is composed of Industrial and Local Unions—that is, of complete organisations or entities—not branches of an organisation, and is merely a conglomerate similar to the General Federation of Trade Unions.

(3) This is answered by No. 2 above.

(4) This is so clumsy an evasion of the truth that we can only suppose the Advocates to imagine their opponents know nothing of the facts. When the I.W.W. was formed it claimed 100,000 members. At the next Annual Convention these figures had dropped to 60 or 70,000. Now they are given as 28,000. Nor is this the most important fact. The union that formed the backbone of the I.W.W. and was lauded in their press and speeches as the most clear-cut revolutionary union in America, is the Western Federation of Miners; and it is just this union, stated to number 30,000 members, that has withdrawn from the I.W.W. No talk of "alleged splits" can cover the seriousness of these facts and figures.

If the existence of so-called industrial unions on the continent of Europe proves the efficiency of this form of organisation, then the so-called "craft" unions must be immensely more efficient as they exist with a far greater membership.

But the truth is that these industrial unions are Anarchist unions and fight Socialism at every opportunity. The strongest and most important of them all—the General Federation of Labour of France—has for years bitterly opposed the Socialist party and propaganda there; while a curious fact—the Australian S.L.P. has withdrawn from the Socialist Federation in Australia that endorsed (not started) the I.W.W. there.

(5) Utter inability to refute our case showing how the A. of I.U. adopt the Anarchist position is proved by the absurd paragraph in question. To talk of conducting an economic strike through the ballot box is sheer idiocy.

(6) While this paragraph is the first attempt to come to anything like close quarters in the discussion, it carefully evades our previous statement. In the first place they have utterly failed to show *how* unarmed workers could prevent the armed "hired assassins" from using the immense stores that are under the control of the capitalist class, in the arsenals, victualing yards, etc.; and in the second place the only "demands" granted the railway workers in Italy were doses of lead in Milan and Barra Bridge. Far from the men winning they were completely routed by the use of the soldiers in running—and compelling the men to run—the services in question.

(7) This paragraph shows how completely the Anarchist notions have bitten into the Ad-

vocates, as the only alternative to an economic struggle they appear capable of grasping is the Bakunine position of street riots with such arms as the workers can secure by purchase or theft. They fail to see that with the control of the political machinery there is control of the ordering departments, and therefore control of the fighting forces already in existence; and until this control is obtained by the workers they cannot hold the means of production.

(8) This reiterates the same old fallacy that, "industrially" organised, the workers are invincible, the absurdity of which we have shown above.

(9) The contention that the capitalists in the seventeenth century were only able to control the Army because they had the means to purchase munitions of war and pay soldiers is entirely inaccurate. Leaving out the point, so well established in the Thirty Years' War, that an Army can support itself while production exists at all, the *bourgeois* class obtained their army in the first place from the militia existing in England and which was under the control of Parliament. When they had conquered political power in the Commons they were able to use this militia to protect themselves, while the King had to rely upon his courtiers and their retainers for an army to fight them, showing in a striking manner the importance of the working class gaining control of the political machinery to accomplish their emancipation.

(10) The naive admission made here well shows how the Advocates merely repeat parrot-like phrases and statements used in America even against facts existing here. The American S.L.P. denounces the Socialist Party there for claiming to be "neutral" on the trade union question. Then the Advocates here—formed by, and largely consisting of members of, the Scots S.L.P.—must use the same phrase against the S.P.G.B., although the subject was debated on Peckham Rye with G. Geis in August, 1906 and again at Plumstead in January, 1907, with Allen; in the latter case the debate was, technically, on the political question, but it was almost wholly taken up with industrial unionism. This is now the third encounter we have had on the subject, yet the Advocates only discover in their second contribution that we are not "neutral" but in opposition! This they say amounts to backing up the existing reactionary trade unions. The fact that we have lately had to defend ourselves in a libel action, due to our criticism of some of these reactionaries, is by itself a sufficient refutation of the statement; but in truth, from the publication of our Manifesto onwards, we have always opposed all organisations that are non-Socialist, whether political or economic.

The almost pathetic reiteration of one sentence from an article by E. J. B. Allen is best met by further quotation from that article.

We must carry on an organised agitation and education within the existing unions to which our members belong, so as to form a nucleus of sound Socialists in each. They should proceed with the educational work . . . so that they can get a sufficient number of sound men within the unions, so that when we are strong enough and conditions are ripe, we can call them out to form the foundation of the Socialist union. . . . Better do this and build a solid foundation by education . . . than pass pious resolutions instructing the E.C. to form Socialist unions at a time when it is a numerical and financial impossibility.

In an article two months previous to the above the same writer stated:—

The question therefore arises can the unions be made of service to the working class? The answer is undoubtedly, yes.

And further on it is said:—

They (the Socialist trade unionists) should, it seems to me, endeavour to effect the sound economic organisation of the workers by systematic propaganda of Socialism inside existing unions: a work which, it must be remembered, has, hitherto, never been seriously undertaken.

In face of these quotations it is unnecessary to labour the point further.

(11) It is now admitted that Kent's resolution did not contain the statement questioned. It is not true that Kent voted for the resolution as amended. The next point is "boring from within." It is stated that "the S.P. allows its members to hold office in existing unions." So do the Advocates! G. Geis, a prominent member of both Advocates and S.L.P., has held office in his trade union as late as last November. Evidently everyone but an "Advocate" holding

office is only "helping to build them up and extend their influence."

(12) The opening statement here is entirely false. Nowhere in the constitution is any provision made for remitting dues, nor is any power given to the Executive Board to do so and where this has occurred, the Executive have acted outside the rules. Every union that entered upon a strike has found itself compelled to organise the non-members without payment of dues, as such payment is obviously impossible then. Local No. 95 were exempted from payment to headquarters because they were supporting an organiser entirely by their own efforts, thus saving the centre a good sum.

In Secretary Trautman's Report to the I.W.W. Convention it is stated that the "Paterson Silk Workers' strike is still pending" and up to time of writing no further report has appeared. In their official organ for June 15th it is pointed out that the blacksmiths, hammermen and helpers of Paterson Locomotive Works all belong to an independent union, and that the I.W.W. helpers worked jointly with them when the strike was called. The above is a sample of the bluff indulged in by the Advocates, but more can be quoted. In the report of July 27th it says a telegram was received saying "Paterson strike won" but neither then nor since have the details of the "victory" been published. The Skowhegan strike was so "big" that in his first report, organiser French described the firm as "a cockroach concern that cannot stand for any long period without going into bankruptcy," and while it was only claimed that the women in the finishing department were in the I.W.W., the whole of the employees came out on strike and received support from various quarters. But here again no details are given of the "victory," while in the case of Bridgeport Machinists, not only is there no mention of the strike in the secretary's report, but it is not claimed anywhere that the strike was won, though it is stated it was "settled." The significance of this silence as to details is vividly shown by the solitary case where they are given and we cannot do better than quote the secretary:—

In the strike of the smelters of Tacoma, Wash., the workers made a splendid showing. The company settled on the terms of the 8 hour day and 15 per cent. increase of wages, but singled out all officers and active workers of the union for the black list. They had to leave the town, after the spokesman of the company had succeeded in having the organisation dissolved. The concessions of the company, however, will not be lived up to, and the misguided few may soon again see the necessity of organising so as to preserve what was conceded on account of the splendid fight conducted by those who were finally made the victims.

Did ever "craft" union win such a "victory"? It must be left to the imagination to picture what the "victories" were on the details of which they are silent.

We are then told that it was the craft unions remaining at work that lost the Schenectady strike. Secretary Trautman says it was due to leading individuals, who afterwards received their rewards in the shape of well-compensated foremen's positions for having delivered the goods (*Ind. Bulletin*, Sept. 18th, 1907), and later on it is stated that "It was C. W. Noonan" who sold out the strike. Our readers may take their choice.

But superior to all these petty details, however, is the point made in our last contribution, namely, that attempts to form Socialist unions with non-Socialist material was a stupid farce and merely encouraged further labour faking. The Advocates have entirely ignored this point, while, in addition to the quotation given above, the following, from the same report, clinch the argument:—

But the unions in Schenectady had hardly gone through the transitory stage of development, unions formerly connected with the American Federation of Labour had joined in full force the Industrial Workers of the World without sufficiently understanding the difference in the basic principles. The change of name did not materially change the structure of the organisation, . . .

And this section of the report closes as follows:— It is essential that in every organisation at least a good minority be fully possessed of the knowledge of the aims and objects of the Industrial Workers of the World, so that in times of conflicts this element can assume control of the situation and rise fully to the occasion required in critical and crucial hours.

So! not only are the rank and file in mass not required to know the principles of the

organisation they join, but not even a majority need know them. All that is wanted is a minority to control and guide the rest. And this is called a Socialist organisation! Nothing we have ever said is so strong a refutation of such a claim as the secretary's own statement given above.

PARTY NOTES.

The Quarter ending September saw a record in the number of new members. It is scarcely to be hoped that the winter quarter can see that record broken, but the opportunity of the winter season should be taken advantage of to inaugurate branch discussions and thus assist in turning out new speakers for next year.

On October 8th the E.C. passed the following resolution: That this meeting of the Executive Committee of The Socialist Party of Great Britain, in view of the public pronouncements of the British Constitution Association hereby challenges that body to appoint a representative to meet a representative of this, the only Socialist party in this country, to publicly debate the following proposition: That as Capitalism involves the exploitation and economic subjection of the working class, the only necessary and useful section of the community, it is necessary and desirable to speedily attain the Object of The Socialist Party of Great Britain, viz., the establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interests of the whole community.

As yet no reply has been received from the champions of capitalism.

Since this resolution appeared in the Press, Mr. H. M. Hyndman has written to the *Daily Telegraph* that the S.D.F. is the "only international Socialist Party in this country." So that, not satisfied with their own brand new name, the S.D.F. wish to annex ours, and also our reputation.

An enquiry was received from Brighton on the attitude of the S.P.G.B. to the question of National and Imperial Defence.

The reply contained the following: The object of the S.P.G.B. implies the assumption of political authority by the working class. Until that object is attained, the capitalist class will control the armed forces of the nation for the defence of capitalist interests. The attitude of the Socialist working class when politically supreme on the question of national defence (should such a question then remain for solution) will depend upon the deliberations of the Socialist Commonwealth in the circumstances of the time.

The Watford Branch of the S.P.G.B. questioned E. E. Hunter while speaking for the S.D.F. and challenged him to debate with a representative of this Party. He agreed, but referred us to the Watford S.D.F., who have not up to the present replied to our request.

It is surprising how the "sweet reasonableness" of those who are not "impossibilists" is sometimes manifested!

The speaker for the Wood Green L.L.P. was also challenged in a similar way. Again we are referred to the local branch, with, as yet, a similar result.

Matters are shaping well in Burnley, and before the next issue is published, no doubt the branch will have been officially formed. Meanwhile sympathisers should communicate with C. H. Schofield, 77, Parliament St., Burnley.

The Head Office of The Socialist Party of Great Britain is at 22, Great James Street, London, W.C.

TO THE DEATH.

We are going, dear friends, to have a very hot time. We shall soon, we understand, be fighting for our very lives. So far we have had an easy time of it. Up to now we have been left severely alone. The "Constitutional" forces have held their hand. We have been allowed plenty of rope. We have enjoyed unfettered liberty; unrestrained license. And we have used our opportunities. We have insinuated our delusive doctrine into the working-class mind. We have inoculated the working class with the poison of our principles. We have preached an unreasonable discontent with things as they are. We have sown dissension between master and man. We have upset the harmony between Capital and Labour. We have dammed up the river of progress. We have throttled industry. We have choked the breath of life out of enterprise. And, if we may loan the chaste expression of the "Constitutional" poet, Kipling, we have played hell generally.

But now we are to be taken in hand very severely. Our pernicious propaganda is to be scotched. Our license is to be endorsed. Reason, my friends, is to be re-seated on its throne, and genius of knowledge will be scattered broadcast as chaff before the wind. The confidence of the "working classes" is to be restored. They will no longer go abroad with the canker of Socialism gnawing at their vitals. Fear for the safety of their little hoards will no longer haunt them. The millions in the Post Office Savings Bank will be rescued from danger of the avaricious maw of the professional agitator. Trade will return from the exile to which we have banished it. There will be plenty of work. Bellies that to-day are filled with the East wind will then be soft and sleek and with fat capon lined. And sweet Peace and happy Content will brood o'er the smiling land of "Wiggin" and "Snellin" and "Owdam" and Manchester, and may even, although this would be expecting too much, come as far South as London and Watford!

So, if we are to maintain our hold on the people; if we are not to be deprived of our comfortable jobs; if we are to continue in the enjoyment of our riotous debauchery; if we want to batten upon the credulity of the workers in the future as now and heretofore, it behoves us to re-organise the forces of brigandage, to look to the joints of our devilish harness, to sharpen our swords and test our bucklers; to strengthen our outworks and our outposts, so as to be ready when the slogan of the "British Constitution Association" and the shrieks of the Shanghai Press herald the imminent attack.

Verily the outlook is dark and full of fearsome portent. But, thank God! the *Daily News* is still to be relied upon. It is going to stand by us in the hour of trial. "And who shall say at close of day which side will have to mourn" while our weakness is voluntarily augmented by its strength? It gives us heart, this chivalrous offer of the noble *News*. We have no words wherewith to frame our thanks—so, on the whole it will be well not to attempt it. But we take courage knowing what we have behind us in Fleet Street, and feel as if we might, much daring, even venture to open the attack. And indeed, that course would, haply, be the best. It would bring our waiting suspense to the issue of action. Yes—we will chance it. We will risk our all on this hazard. We will enter the lists. We will pick up the gauntlet—if it has been thrown. We will throw it ourselves if it hasn't. We will. Now! Up! herald. Hang our banner on the outer wall. And you there, you with the trumpets, blow! you beggars, blow!

So. 'Tis done. And now, soft, while our champion speaks. Sh-s-s-s—

To the Lord Balfour of Burleigh, President of the "British Constitution Association," the Lord Northcliffe (of the *Daily Mail*), the Lord Burnham (of the *Daily Telegraph*), the potential Lord Pearson (of the *Daily Express*), and all others whom it may concern; give ear. The Socialist Party of Great Britain, the head and front of that which stands to you for offence; the only party in this land that fights consistently and unwaveringly for Socialism; the party that preaches relentless war upon the capitalism for which you stand; the party that is organising the working class of this country to the end that shall spell the extermination of

the capitalist; the party that is inciting the worker to revolt; that is urging him to seize the control of the political machine in his own interest so that he may the more surely capture and hold the factory and the railway and the workshop against the power of the employer; this Socialist Party of Great Britain gives you defiance and bids you select your champion—the mightiest man amongst you—so that he may do battle in the lists of rhetoric on your behalf and in your defence. The Socialist Party of Great Britain will meet you in hall or street or Press; its champions will combat yours one at a time or—or all at once! They will take you on *seriatim*—one down t'other come on—or *en bloc*. They will oppose a working man to the most skilful of your professors, in the largest hall or the smallest, in London or the provinces, on Sunday or any other time, in season or out of season, on any question that will bring to a direct issue the relationship of the working class to the capitalist class. Name your man or men, my lords, or if their valour is outweighed by their discretion, come on yourselves. You will receive the warmest of welcome, but—your case will be slaughtered to make a working-class holiday. The god of Capital help you in that day, my lords, for verily, you will want it.

Since writing the foregoing the *Daily Express* (October 10th, 1907), the exponent of what may fairly be called the "bad-egg and flour-bag" method of argument, has come out with a woefully frank, and, for the *Daily Express*, an amazingly honest expression of the importance of the British Constitution Association and the anti-Socialist propagandist generally. Says Pearson's Pride—

ANTI-SOCIALIST TACTICS.

The anti-Socialist winter campaign is again in full swing, and the battle will shortly be joined all along the line. There is one tactical feature of the Socialist plan of campaign which is worthy of close attention. It is now the order of the day in the enemy's ranks to issue challenges to anti-Socialist speakers to take part in joint public debates. The motive of this particular procedure is well defined, and, from our opponents' point of view the result is likely to be profitable to the movement.

To accept these challenges—except in special cases and for particular reasons—would be to play into the enemy's hands. What anti-Socialists want is to put Socialism on its own defence. It behoves us, therefore, to point out quite candidly that, as matters now stand, the average Socialist speaker is better primed on Socialism than the average anti-Socialist. The London Municipal Society will probably make a point of organising a department whose duty it will be to provide text-books as well as speakers to meet the Socialists on their own ground. When that is accomplished we shall probably hear no more of Socialist challenges.—*Daily Express*, 8.10.07.

The italics are our own. Observe, "the battle" is to be "joined all along the line," but—the join must not be made too effectively. The enemy must be engaged—at a respectful distance. Socialism must be put upon its trial, but for heaven's sake don't let the trial take place upon a B.C.A. platform unless the prisoner is muzzled and gagged! If you do it will surely be to the advantage of the Socialist Movement, because, don't you see, the Socialist has the facts and the Constitutionalist hasn't. The Socialist, of course, is all wrong. He hasn't a leg to stand on. He hasn't a shred of evidence to support his case. His objective is a chimera. His principles are an outrage on common sense. His methods are fanatical and dangerous to the well known peace and prosperity of this our land. He is a fool where he isn't a fraud. Put upon its trial Socialism must fail upon every count, but whatever you do, don't let its champions defend themselves upon your platforms. And don't get upon the Socialist platform. That would be quite as bad—in fact worse. Join "the battle all along the line," but—caution, eager hearts! the Socialist is an artful person and you are artless. When you get that text book you will be all right, but until then put Socialism on its trial—and may the spirit of stern resolve and lofty purpose that animated our Drakes and Whitaker Wrights and Nelsons, Lord Cowleys and the rest of our Empire builders strengthen your arms and direct your aims so that your flour and eggs and other such arguments may speed true. As it is, as it will be until the arrival of that text book, the B.C.A. gentlemen are on the clear confession of the enlightened *Express*,

without even the means of combating the "absurdities," "illogical sophistries," "evidenceless postulates and reasonless conclusions," of that danger to the Constitution, the Socialist. Did ever army march out to join "the battle all along the line" with such rotten equipment?

AGRA.

A CLARION VANNER Takes the Socialist Platform.

On Sunday, September 15th, while Comrade Fitzgerald was speaking at our Finsbury Park meeting, a member of the audience asked "was it a fact that the Clarion Van speakers had instructions from the London Van Committee to refuse to answer questions put by members of The Socialist Party of Great Britain?" He put the question, he said, because he was informed that a Clarion Vanner was in the audience, and he wished to give him the opportunity to deny the allegation if he could do so. The questioner was, further, anxious to know why the Clarion Van Committee would not allow their speakers questions from the Socialists. Thereupon Mr. Fred Bramley, late Clarion Van speaker, asked for the platform and his request was, of course, acceded to.

Mr. Bramley said he had never refused to answer questions from anyone, and had always preached the principles of unadulterated Socialism. By Socialism he meant the socialisation of the means of production, distribution and exchange. Nationalisation or municipalisation were not Socialism, but simply exploitation in another form. He then asked for questions from members of the S.P.G.B., and upon it being pointed out to him that he was not there to ask for questions, but to deny, if he could, the statement that Clarion Van speakers were instructed to refuse to answer questions from Socialists, Mr. Bramley replied that he held the platform, and all the ordinary rules of procedure went by the board.

Comrade Fitzgerald then pointed out that Mr. Gavan Duffy admitted, at Wood Green, that he had received instructions from the Clarion Van Committee not to accept questions from Socialists. Fitzgerald also stated that questions had been refused at Clapham and Wimbledon, and also by Mr. Hartley at Willeiden, and he drew Mr. Bramley's attention to the fact that Mr. Howard, of the Clarion Van Committee, had openly stated from our platform in Finsbury Park that Mr. Gavan Duffy was not to blame, as he was only acting under instructions from the Van Committee. Our comrade then dealt with Mr. Bramley's definition of Socialism, and showed the unsoundness of the phrase "the socialisation of the means of production, distribution and exchange," the means of exchange being money, which is only necessary under a system of private ownership. Under Socialism, production being no longer carried on for exchange, and the products being owned collectively by the whole of the people, the means of exchange will become superfluous, yet he (Mr. Bramley) talked of socialising it. The *Clarion* advocated nationalisation and municipalisation, and was therefore a misleading organ, contrary to the principles of Socialism. Moreover, the success of the Clarion Vanners depended upon the number of *Clarions* sold at the meetings, and seeing that the *Clarion* advocated nationalisation and municipalisation, Mr. Bramley could not but admit that he assisted in anti-Socialist propaganda. If it was not a personal question why was he not now a Clarion Vanner, seeing that they were advertising for speakers.

Mr. Bramley, replying, said the questions were not on Socialism. The reason he was not now a Clarion Vanner was a personal one. It was a suggestion of impure motives, he said, to say that the success of a Clarion Vanner depended upon the number of *Clarions* sold, but it is noticeable that he did not deny the statement. Mr. Bramley still insisted upon having questions upon the principles of Socialism. He was asked if he advised the workers to avoid the L.L.P., S.D.F. etc., as non-Socialist organisations, and to join the S.P.G.B., and replied that he preached the principles of Socialism and left the people to judge for themselves as to which

political party to join. Did he advise the workers to avoid the Liberal and Tory parties was the next question given to the ex-Vanner, and the answer being in the affirmative, Bramley was then called upon to explain why he did not preach Socialism and advise the workers to avoid the I.L.P. and S.D.F. as supporters of capitalism. The cases were not parallel, he declared, but he could not show wherein the divergence lay. Mr. Bramley, in answer to a question, said that he believed organisation to be necessary for the attainment of Socialism, and explained his inconsistency in advising the workers to join such anti-Socialist organisations as the S.D.F., and the I.L.P. by saying that he did not agree that they were anti-Socialist. Nevertheless he had to admit that we were the only pure organisation. He agreed that an organisation advocating the support of capitalism was acting contrary to the principles of Socialism, and to the interest of the working class. Having denied that the I.L.P. supported capitalism, Mr. Bramley was asked whether Mr. Ramsay MacDonald at Leicester, Mr. James Parker at Halifax, and Mr. Fred Jowett at Bradford supported capitalism when they entered into a compact with the Liberals. Amidst roars of laughter he attempted to repudiate the action of these individuals as not representing the policy of the I.L.P., which, he said, was settled at their Annual Conference. Asked was he not aware that Mr. Keir Hardie at the York Conference of the I.L.P. admitted that this policy had been followed with the object of keeping out the Tories, he answered that he was not aware of this fact. Mr. Bramley was then shown a leading article in the *Labour Leader* stating that the I.L.P. supported the Liberal candidate at Bury, and he could not deny that as this had never been repudiated it stood as their policy. Was the I.L.P. a Socialist organisation was then submitted, and elicited the reply that it was an organisation that would fulfil a need for a considerable time. (Oh, oh! from the crowd). The questioner refused to accept this answer and he was then told that the I.L.P. is a Socialist organisation, and amidst interruption and laughter Mr. Bramley said that he had been a member of it for twelve years.

The ex-Vanner was now called upon to show how we can socialise capital. "I cannot tell you," he said, "the socialisation of capital is an impossibility." Asked now why he was a member of an organisation the object of which was an impossibility, he denied that the object of the I.L.P. was to socialise capital, and asserted that it was "the socialisation of the means of production, distribution, and exchange." He was then informed that a perusal of the I.L.P. literature would show him that the object of the I.L.P. was "socialisation of land and capital," so that he was a member of an organisation yet at the same time ignorant of its object. Mr. Bramley had by this time had enough of it and he relinquished a platform that for him had proved a pillory.

THE CHIEF.

SUNDAY EVENINGS

AT

Battersea Branch

(LABURNHAM HOUSE, 134, HIGH STREET).

Nov. 3rd—SOCIAL FOR MEMBERS AND FRIENDS.

10th—J. FITZGERALD:

"Can Capitalism be Palliated?"

17th—F. C. WATTS:

"Reform or Revolution?"

24th—F. E. DAWKINS:

"The Anti-Socialist Crusade?"

Commence at 8 p.m. Questions, Discussion. Opponents warmly welcomed.

TO NEWSAGENTS.

"The Socialist Standard" and all other publications of The Socialist Party of Great Britain are supplied to the trade by Henderson's, 16, Paternoster Row, London, E.C., and Charing Cross Road, London, W.C.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

HEAD OFFICE:

22, GREAT JAMES STREET, LONDON, W.C.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—A. Jones, Secretary, 3, Mathew St., Latchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at S.P.G.B., Laburnam House, 134, High Street, Battersea, S.W. Club open every evening.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Executive Committee. Applications should be sent to the General Secretary.

EAST HAM.—W. Gifford, Sec., 31, Maryland Square, Stratford. Branch meets Mondays at 7.30 at 447, Katherine Rd., Forest Gate.

EDMONTON.—Sidney Auty, Sec., 60, Gilpin Grove, Edmonton. Branch meets Wednesdays 8.30.

FULHAM.—E. Waller, Secretary, 45, Warple Way, Wandsworth, S.W. Branch meets alternate Mondays at 8.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Fri. at 8.30 at 79, Grove Rd., Holloway. Communications to the Sec.

MANCHESTER.—J. Marsh, Sec., 97, Blantyre Street, Swinton, Nr. Manchester.

PADDINGTON.—T. Hopley, Sec., 92, Rucklidge Avenue, Harlesden, N.W. Branch meets every Wednesday, 8.30 p.m., at Harley's Coffee Tavern (foot of Lock Bridge), Harrow Rd.

PECKHAM.—W. Wren, Sec., 91, Evelina Rd., Nunhead, S.E. Branch meets every Wed. at 8.30.

ROMFORD DIVISION.—All communications to the Secretary, S.P.G.B. Club, 39, York Road, Ilford. Branch meets Mondays at 8 at Club.

TOOTING.—Communications to the Secretary, 86, Mellison Road, Tooting, where branch meets every Wednesday, at 8.30 p.m.

TOTTENHAM.—T. W. Lobb, Sec. Branch meets Mondays at 8 p.m., at Sunbeam Coffee Tavern, 258, High Rd., followed by discussion class.

WATFORD.—T. Wilkins, Sec., 4, Marlborough Rd., Branch meets alternate Fridays at 8 p.m.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Mondays 7.30, followed at 8.30 by discussion, at 447, Katherine Road, Forest Gate.

WOOD GREEN.—H. Crump, Secretary, 39, Hermitage Road, Harringay, N. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Mondays at 8.30 at 2, Station Road, Wood Green.

MANIFESTO

OF THE

Socialist Party of Great Britain.

Second Edition, with preface, now ready.

Explains the Party's position towards the S.D.F., I.L.P., Fabian Society, Trade Unions, S.L.P., etc.

Price - One Penny.

Post free 1½d. per copy from the S.P.G.B., 22, Great James Street, London, W.C.

ART, LABOUR and SOCIALISM.

By WILLIAM MORRIS.

Price - One Penny.

Post free 1½d. from the S.P.G.B., 22, Great James Street, London, W.C.

From Handicraft to Capitalism,

Translated from the German of KARL KAUTSKY.

The only translation in the English language of this important section of the famous "Das Erfurter Program."

POST FREE ... 1½d.
From S.P.G.B., 22, Great James St., London, W.C.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

HOLDS

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master-class, and the consequent enslavement of the working-class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working-class from the domination of the master-class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working-class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist-class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working-class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working-class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master-class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

APPLICATION FOR MEMBERSHIP.

To the Secretary,

.....Branch, S.P.G.B.

I hereby declare my adhesion to the above principles, and request enrolment as a member of The Socialist Party of Great Britain.

Signature.....

Address.....

.....

Date.....

SPECIAL NOTE—This form cannot be accepted if detached from Declaration printed above. The complete column must be handed to branch Sec.

The
Official Organ
of
The
Socialist Party
of
Great Britain.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

No. 40. Vol. 4.]

LONDON, DECEMBER, 1907.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

ROUT OF THE RAILWAY MEN.

THE "METZ" OF THE A.S.R.S.

CURIOUS indeed are the parallels that history furnishes us between incidents and events, often apparently unlike, and separated by time and position from each other. History, of course, does not actually repeat itself, and the parallels must not be pushed too far, but in the salient points of likeness valuable lessons may be learnt and deductions drawn for our future guidance.

It will be remembered how, in the Franco-German War of 1870-71, Marshal Bazaine had been surrounded by the German Army and driven into Metz fortress, with 180,000 men and large munitions of war. Instead of using this immense force to break through the lines and join the other French armies, as every canon of military and national expediency demanded, he tried, as he afterwards confessed, to negotiate with Bismarck for the surrender of France on the condition that he (Bazaine) should be allowed to retain his own army and establish himself as dictator after the peace. Bismarck played with him till the opportunity for a successful sortie had passed and then became adamant. On October 27th, 1870, Metz was surrendered unconditionally, and the immense army passed into the possession of the Germans and remained prisoners until it suited the interest of the German ruling class—personified in Bismarck—to set them free to crush the Communards in Paris.

At the opening of the war between France and Germany, it was claimed by the French generals that it would be a triumphal procession from Paris to Berlin. Sadova was forgotten. But the results showed a reversal of the procession, and it was Paris, not Berlin, that was besieged.

Attempts have been made to defend Bazaine on the ground that the huge war stores were largely "fake"; that the contractors had swindled the commissariat by supplying barrels of sawdust for food, empty cases for cartridges, and brown paper for boots. We need not now inquire whether Bazaine was a party to the frauds and received his share of the plunder. The revelations made in this country a short time ago show how far up as well as how low down these "business operations" extend. But the very shortage of real supplies should have been an added incentive to rapid action on Bazaine's part, and the excuse only emphasizes his guilt.

The parallel of Metz with the recent struggle between the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants and the Railway Companies is remarkable. Firstly, preceding the conference held on November 6th, the officials of the A.S.R.S. had declared that it must be "recognition" of themselves or war. The men had been asked to vote upon this point, and an overwhelming majority declared in favour of enforcing this "recognition" by a strike if the companies refused to accept their demand. To-day, despite this vote, "recogni-

tion" is swept out of existence for seven years. This by itself would be a small point were it not coupled with the fact that the rank and file of the Railway Servants—union and non-union alike—have been surrendered, bound hand and foot, to the companies for those seven years. Never was "victory" so disastrous.

It is unnecessary to go into the full details of the Conciliation and Arbitration Scheme agreed to by the officials of the railway servants and the companies, but the essentials may be stated. For the purpose of this scheme each company is a unit that sends its representatives to the Sectional and Central Conciliation Boards, as well as before the final arbitrator, when any matter is carried so far. The men, however, employed by each company, are divided first into sectional groups along trade lines, and then into geographical groups for the purpose of electing their representatives. The whole of the employees are concerned in this election, and their representatives must be chosen from among themselves, and their power is rigidly confined to dealing with the hours and wages only of the particular section they represent. When a Sectional Board fails to agree, the Central Board, composed of the representatives of the company and one or more chosen from the employees' side of the Sectional Board, shall consider the matter. In the event of this Board disagreeing, the matter is referred to a single arbitrator, appointed by agreement between the two sides of the Board, or, failing this agreement, by the Speaker of the House of Commons and the Master of the Rolls. The decision of this arbitrator shall be binding upon all parties.

Here, then, we have not only no "recognition" of the Union or its officials, but a deliberate flouting of the latter in that all representatives are to be elected from the employees themselves. Both Mr. Bell and the *Daily News* claim that the officials may represent the men before the final arbitrator, but while Lord Claud Hamilton says "recognition" has been completely abolished, the scheme is silent on this point, leaving the deduction to be drawn that it is the members of the Central Board who will argue before the final arbitrator.

In attempting to defend his claim for official recognition by the directors of the companies, Mr. Bell pointed out that if an employee were to go forward with any grievance his position of dependence upon the very people he was meeting almost paralyzed his efforts, but the trade union official, with a security of living outside the company, could argue every point. Moreover, it was stated, and numerous instances given in support, that an employee going forward to complain of the grievances of himself and his fellow workers, was thence a marked man and, if not discharged at once, some technical point would be found and used as an excuse for discharging him a little later. The whole of this contention has now been thrown overboard by the signing

of this scheme.

It is exactly at the first move where this protection is most wanted, and even if Mr. Bell were correct in saying that officials could appear before the arbitrator, this would leave the men completely defenceless in bringing forward any complaint, as it must pass through the other stages first. Moreover, these Boards only deal with "hours and wages," thereby leaving the other conditions of employment completely in the control of the companies, while in case of victimisation the men have absolutely no chance of redress, or even of discussion, under this scheme. A man who pushes forward the claims of his fellow workmen vigorously may be elected to the Board, and the company could then discharge him, while the men would be unable to lodge any protest through that Board.

Secondly, the excuse of the "faked" stores at Metz is paralleled by the position of the "stores" or fighting fund of the A.S.R.S. The officials boasted of having £362,733 in their funds. But, according to the *Railway News*, £192,422 belong to the provident fund, and, under the Friendly Societies Acts, could not be touched for strike purposes. This would leave £170,311 for a fighting fund for over 100,000 men, as not only would the actual members of the A.S.R.S. require support, but the non-union men who might have come out would also need keeping. Even this does not reveal the whole truth, for the A.S.R.S. have over £120,000 invested in municipal loans, and £51,000 in railway companies' stock!

Could incompetence or insanity go further? Here is a sum, nearly one-third of their theoretical fighting fund, placed in the hands of the very people they have to fight. It is as though Bazaine had placed a portion of his ammunition in the German camp "to be kept dry." With so small a fighting fund at their disposal the necessity for swift and decisive action on the part of the A.S.R.S. was imperative. Yet not only are the negotiations—or rather attempts at negotiations—kept dawdling about for over twelve months, but the chance to strike a blow in the busy season is, as the *Daily News* stated, deliberately thrown away by the officials.

More important, however, is the fact that the agitation was originally for an "All Grades" advance of wages and shortening of hours for all employees. This was pushed on one side at the first opportunity and the question of "recognition" put in its place, while the men were gulled into believing that "recognition" was all important. As though the example of the Boilermakers' Society a short time ago was not at hand for them to see the value of "recognition" without the power to enforce their demands. When the Boilermakers refused to accept the conditions that their "recognised" officials had agreed to, they were served with a week's lock-out notices, and, frantically appealed to by those officials, finally accepted the employers' terms.

The engineering employers on the Clyde "recognise" the A.S.R.S. to such good purpose that the "recognised" officials were used to keep the men at work after they had twice voted in favour of a strike to improve their conditions. The A.S.R.S. is itself recognised by the North Eastern Railway Co., with the results that were dealt with in our August issue. In spite of all these facts the men were fooled into believing that "recognition" was of more importance than better wages or shorter hours; that dawdling about and sacrificing their chance of an effective blow during the busy season was more "diplomatic" and likely to obtain "public sympathy" (whatever that may mean) than insisting upon their original demands would have been. They voted in this belief, and back with terrific force is sent the answer: "seven years shalt thou serve in complete bondage."

As far as any work, other than that of a sick benefit society, on behalf of its members is concerned, the A.S.R.S. is practically dead for the next seven years. Mr. Bell's pathetic appeal to all employees to join the A.S.R.S. can hardly evoke a hearty response seeing that the Boards, after the first election, will manage their own details. There is absolutely no place in the scheme for, and therefore no reason for the existence of, the A.S.R.S., while the scheme lasts.

It may be objected that the officials were recognised seeing how Bismarck they were asked to sign the "Recognised" Scheme on behalf of the men. Yes! exactly as Bismarck "recognised" Bazine—until his operations were complete.

The union officials—for it must be remembered that the men have not been consulted at all on this Scheme—have been used as the tools of the companies in signing an agreement binding upon both union and non-union men, and then have been completely flouted in the Scheme itself and the unions ignored.

It needed but the last cynical point in the scheme to show how completely the companies have triumphed. The months of August and September are the favourite holiday months of sections of the capitalist class, including railway directors and managers, and with supreme irony it is laid down that the conciliation Boards shall not be called together during these months.

In the Franco-German War no single disaster—not even Sedan—was so completely crushing as Bazine's treacherous surrender of Metz.

In the history of trade unionism no parallel can be found to this crushing disaster called "The Settlement of the Railway Crisis." Never before has so large a body of workers been delivered over to their masters, bound hand and foot by such a cast iron scheme of "conciliation," without their being allowed any voice or vote in the settlement. It is the greatest victory for the employers on record, and will act as a great incentive to other large employers to adopt the beauties and powers afforded to them by such "conciliation" schemes.

Between the working class producing all the wealth that exists in Society, on one hand, and the capitalist owning, through the robbery of the workers, that wealth on the other hand, there must of necessity exist a bitter struggle for life itself. For the workers to own the means of life means the abolition of the capitalist class and system; for the capitalist class to exist means the continued subjection and slavery of the workers. There can be no "conciliation" or "arbitration" between the robber and his victim. The working class has nothing to arbitrate or conciliate but has itself to emancipate.

Let the railway servants study these facts and realise the necessity for depending upon themselves instead of allowing "diplomatic" leaders to guide them to ambushes and disasters. Let them learn from their own past history how the employing class will use any and every means, from bribing so-called leaders with an office under Government to pouring troops and Maxims into the troubled areas as at Featherstone and Belfast, for the purpose of preserving their own position. Then, while organising upon the class basis for the overthrow of capitalism, they will organise upon the same basis for the purpose of fighting their battles upon the economic field, and, ignoring such phantoms as "public opinion," use every available opportunity to strike sudden and far-reaching blows for the improve-

ment of their conditions and wages. Along with the Labour misleaders will be swept away the superstitious nonsense of "conciliating" or "arbitrating" robbery; and if only this lesson be learnt, then the parallel to Bazine's action at Metz in the signing of the Scheme at Whitehall will not have been in vain.

J. FITZGERALD.

SOCIALISM AND SOCIAL REFORM.

THERE are many people who regard Socialism merely as a demand for Social Reform, as a desire on the part of certain sections of the community for better conditions of labour and living for the working class. This misconception is largely due to organisations claiming to be "Socialist" but devoting their energies to the propagation of reforms, whereby the real issue is obscured, the sympathies of the kind-hearted are aroused and, at election times, the support and votes of those who know nothing of Socialism, but believe in some particular "ameliorative" measure, are secured. It is this kind of "Socialism" that leads people to talk of the Socialist demand as "the true development of the Liberalism which won the working classes the franchise and other privileges they now enjoy," although, as the Tories justly claim, many of these "privileges" were granted by them in the teeth of the opposition of the champions of Liberalism. It was, therefore, refreshing to read Mr. Balfour's speech at Birmingham on November 14th. In truth, he said, there is no difficulty or ambiguity about the subject at all. Socialism has one meaning and one meaning alone. Socialism means and can mean nothing else than that the community . . . is to take all the means of production into its own hands, that private property and private enterprise are to come to an end and all that private enterprise and private property carry with them. That, continued Mr. Balfour, is Socialism, and nothing else is Socialism. In discussing the difference between Socialism and social reform, he said: Social reform is when the State, based upon private enterprise, based upon private property, recognising that the best productive results can only be obtained by respecting private property and encouraging private enterprise, asks them to contribute towards great national and public objects.

In other words, social reform leaves the basis of Society untouched, and does not affect the relative condition of the propertied class and the working class in the least. On the other hand, Socialism means the abolition of private property and the establishment of common ownership and control of the means of wealth production. It is therefore easy to understand why those who are opposed to Socialism advocate social reform, but it is inexplicable why those who claim to be out for Socialism should, by their advocacy of social reform, help the master class to maintain their supremacy, and side-track the workers from the only cause that can emancipate them, the cause of Revolutionary Socialism.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

A. PORCELLI, Baron de St. Andrew (The Cottage, Camberley).—Your statement that Society cannot be divided into two classes because "there are, for instance, children in arms," is distinctly refreshing. We are, however, always glad to deal with intelligent opposition. We note also that you profess to belong neither "to the working class nor to the capitalist class, but to a much nobler class, viz, the Sons of God." Nevertheless, if as we surmise the necessities and comforts of life which you enjoy in your baronial "Cottage" do not descend direct from heaven, but are the products of worldly labour, it would materially assist us in deciding (at least to our own satisfaction) to which economic category you belong if we were informed whether your present income is the result of your own mental and physical labour, or is derived through the ownership of property and is therefore a tax on others' labour. This is not a personal question, for "we must all toil, and (howsoever we name our stealing)."

The statements regarding your numerous charities to the distressed working class prove only that those who produce the wealth do not enjoy it and that the appropriators, who flourish through the workers' misery, accompany their alms with misunderstanding and contempt. We would, indeed,

in this connection (in return for the text on unclean beasts to which you referred us) commend to you respectfully Matthew VI, 1-4.

You assert that we are "perfectly ignorant of the Bible." But to this we cannot plead guilty; for we regard and use the Bible as a valuable historical document of the upper status of barbarism in social evolution. As you, however, appear to value the Bible in quite another sense may we suggest that you take as texts for your next epistle Matthew XIX, 21-24 and Isaiah V., 8?

We cannot afford space to deal with all the curiously points you raise. Your point of view, moreover, not being that of a wage-worker, and presenting otherwise no common ground of logic and experience as a basis for argument, renders further discussion difficult.

Socialism, as such, is not directly concerned with religion or the supernatural, and is not antagonistic thereto except in so far as religion is used against the working class. It would, however, be idle to deny that the fulcrum toward obtaining a rational conception of life provided by the scientific basis of Socialism can ultimately leave no room in the consistent mind for belief in the supernatural.

The concluding statement in your letter that "Woe betide the man who ignorantly seeks to make God responsible for the warped nature of fellow man, and the evils produced by Satanic devilry" is, as applied to us, entirely gratuitous; and you may be comforted by the assurance that we hold no metaphysical cloud-pusher responsible for the misery of the world.

G.H.L. (Kentish Town).—No. There is no "mental labour" that does not involve physical labour, and no physical or manual labour that does not involve mental labour also. When we speak of labour we do not discriminate between mental and manual, they are complementary.

The distinction you also desire to make between the "producer" of commodities, such as the brick-maker, and the "non-producer" such as the transport worker, will not hold. The transport worker is just as much a producer as the brickmaker, neither really produces in the sense you mean, both however are engaged in producing values. The brickmaker usefully alters the form of the raw material supplied by nature, and the transport worker usefully alters its position; embodying in the process, quite as much as the brickmaker, a portion of the labour necessary to placing the bricks upon the market and creating values in so doing.

F.D. (Wimbledon).—There are essentially but two classes to-day, as we say. The capitalist class comprises all those whose income is derived from the ownership of property and is contrasted with the working class which comprises all those (with their dependents) who are possessors of only their power to labour which they are forced to sell to those who monopolise the means of wealth production.

All marketable wealth is the product of labour, and the able-bodied man who lives without contributing his quota of the necessary labour is robbing his fellows.

On the border line, between the two classes of exploiter and exploited, (which are, on the whole, vividly distinct), there are a number—with a foot in each camp—called the "middle class." The members of this group are becoming an almost negligible factor owing to the growing centralisation of industry, but in so far as they express themselves politically they cling tenaciously to the capitalist side of their interests, and all the more desperately since the small property or position that they hold is alone that which distinguishes them from the working class properly so-called; and this small property or means of exploitation is that by means of which they hope to climb into the select and secure section of the exploiters and so save themselves from the proletarian abyss which ever threatens to engulf them. Hence this section of lower capitalists is not only reactionary in that it fights against industrial advance, but also is most unscrupulous in defending its right to exploit, in sweating, and in conserving its monopoly of education or position against the interests of the workers. A small section, it is true, would "organise" the workers, on condition that it be given (under title of "the expert") all the well-paid jobs and the right to govern the masses; but in face of a genuine proletarian advance all of these stand by the reaction and bitterly oppose genuine industrial democracy.

It is therefore seen that as economic categories reflecting politically their fundamentally opposing interests, there are, in reality, but two classes: those who live by labour and those who live upon those who labour; so that the workers in their task of abolishing all privilege and exploitation, stand alone, and must rely only upon themselves.

J.T.T.—Thanks for information. We are always pleased to receive local papers with interesting articles or reports. Your query will be dealt with next month.

Order THE SOCIALIST STANDARD through your local newsagent. If you have any difficulty in obtaining it regularly please communicate with the S.P.G.B., 22, Gt. James St., London, W.C.

[CONTINUED FROM NOVEMBER ISSUE.]

THE PROLETARIAT

(The Working Class).

By KARL KAUTSKY.

Specially translated for The Socialist Party of Great Britain and approved by the Author.

6. THE GROWING EXTENT OF THE WORKING CLASS.

THE COMMERCIAL AND THE "EDUCATED" PROLETARIAT.

It is not only by the extension of industry on a large scale that the capitalist mode of production makes the proletarian conditions general. It is also caused by the position of the wage-workers in industries on a large scale becoming the standard for the position of the wage-workers in other spheres of activity. And their conditions of work and life are revolutionised by the large-scale industries.

The advantages which these workers may perhaps have possessed over those employed in capitalist industries are now, by the influence of the latter, changed into so many disadvantages. Where, for instance, to-day the worker of a handicraft still boards and lodges with his master, the aforesaid change results in this handicraft worker being worse fed and housed than the wage-worker who has a household of his own. The long apprenticeship was, in times gone by, a means for preventing a glut of workers in handicraft; to-day the system of apprenticeship is the most effective means of producing a glut of cheap workers in handicraft and of depriving the adult workers of their livelihood.

Here also, as in other directions, things that under the domination of petty enterprise were reasonable and a boon, have become nonsensical and a hindrance owing to the capitalist mode of production.

The endeavour of guild-masters to revive the old guild system may in the main be ascribed to the desire to create, by the revival of the old forms, new means for the purpose of exploiting their workmen. They seek to save themselves from the bog by throwing down and stepping on proletarian bodies.

And these gentlemen grow indignant when the working class fails to become enthusiastic over this method of delaying somewhat the inevitable extinction of petty enterprise.

Commercial trading undergoes a similar development to handicraft. The large enterprise squeezes out of existence the petty enterprise, even in the sphere of petty trading.

The small commercial undertakings need not, therefore, diminish in number. Petty trading becomes the last refuge of those who have gone bankrupt among the small producers.

In the German empire there were employed per thousand workers in each particular group:—

ESTABLISHMENTS	INDUSTRIAL.		COMMERCIAL. (including Licensed Victuallers.)	
	1882.	1895.	1882.	1895.
With 1 - 5 employees	551	399	757	697
" 6 - 50 "	186	238	202	243
Over 50 "	263	363	41	60

From this table it will be gathered that in commercial and licensed establishments petty enterprise predominates far more than in industry, and declines less rapidly—speaking relatively. Speaking absolutely, petty enterprise is on the increase in commerce and the licensed victuallers' trade. The number of employees in these callings increased from 1,013,981 in 1882 to 1,509,453 in 1895.

To restrict petty trading—for instance by restricting hawking or peddling—would mean nothing else but to sweep those who are getting their livelihood in that way completely off their feet and to force them into the ranks of the loafing class; that is to say, to compel them to become beggars, vagabonds, or jailbirds—which would indeed be a typical social reform.

The influence of the development of industry on a large scale, as far as petty trading is concerned, does not find expression in a decrease in the number of small trading concerns, but in their actual dwindling away. The existence of petty traders on their own account becomes continually more insecure and more like that of proletarians. Besides, there is a steady increase in the number of those employed in large concerns, who become real proletarians, and have no prospect of ever going into business on their own account; child- and woman-labour continues to extend, the latter accompanied by increased prostitution. Overwork, unemployment, and the cutting down of wages also enter this sphere of employment. The position of the commercial employee is approaching that of the industrial proletarian. The former can be distinguished from the latter almost in only one way, namely, by his keeping up the appearance, at a great sacrifice, of a higher social position, while the industrial proletarian knows nothing of practising such deception.

And yet another category of proletarians begins to develop: the educated proletarian. To be educated has, in our present mode of production, become quite a separate business. The scope of knowledge has grown immensely and is widening from day to day. And capitalist society as well as the capitalist state, require more and more men of science and art for the conduct of their affairs, for the subjection of the forces of nature, be it for the purpose of production or destruction, or for the luxurious utilisation of their increasing affluence. But not only the peasant, the handicraftsman or proletarian, but even the merchant, the manufacturer, the banker, the stock exchange gambler and the large land-owner have no time to devote to art or science. Their time is fully taken up by their business and amusements. In present society it is

(To be continued.)

not, as under former systems of society, the exploiters themselves, or at least a section of them, who foster art and science. They leave that occupation to a separate class, whom they pay for their services. Education becomes a commodity.

But until several decades ago it was still a rare commodity. There were but few schools, and study involved considerable expense. The peasants were mostly not in a position to be able to raise the means for sending their sons to the higher schools. Handicraft and commerce on the other hand were still in a prosperous condition; hence, whosoever was engaged in these callings remained in them; only the fact of being specially gifted or in exceptional circumstances induced the son of the handicraftsman or merchant to take up the study of art or science. While the demand for officials, technical experts, medical men, teachers, artists, etc., increased, the supply was almost entirely restricted to the progeny from such circles.

The commodity education commanded therefore a high price. Its possession brought at least a comfortable living to those who turned it to practical account, like lawyers, officials, medical men, professors, etc.,—often fame and honour also. The artist, the poet, the philosopher were the companions of kings. The intellectual aristocrat considered himself superior to the aristocrat by birth or money. His only concern was the development of his intellectual gifts. Consequently the educated could be idealists, and often were such. They stood above the other classes and their material aspirations and antagonisms. Education meant power, happiness, and amiableness; therefore the conclusion lay near, that, in order to make all men happy and amiable, to surmount all class antagonism and to abolish poverty and degradation, nothing more was required than the diffusion of education.

Since then the spreading of higher school education—and here it is only a question of higher education—has made gigantic strides. The number of educational establishments has immensely increased. The number of scholars has grown to a still greater extent. Petty enterprise in commerce and industry no longer offers chances of prosperity. The petty bourgeois is unable to save his children from drifting into the ranks of the proletariat unless he can manage to give them a university education, providing, of course, it is possible for him to rake together sufficient means for this end. And he must think of providing not only for his sons but also for his daughters; for the progress in the division of labour gradually transforms, as already mentioned, household work into separate occupations, thus reducing more and more the work in the home, so that a marriage in which the wife is only the housekeeper, and not at least partly bread-winner, becomes increasingly a luxury. At the same time, however, the petty bourgeoisie falls into greater poverty, as we have seen, so that it loses the ability of affording a luxury. The number of celibates increases, as does the number of families in which wife and daughter have to work to augment the income of the family. Thus female labour increases not only in the direction of the petty and large industry, and of petty trading, but also in the sphere of officialdom in Government and private employment, as, for instance, in the post and telegraph offices, railways, banks, art and science. However loud the protest on the grounds of prejudice or personal interest may be, female labour enters increasingly into the various spheres of intellectual activity. It is not conceit, neither insolence nor uppishness, but the compulsion due to economic development, which forces women to seek occupation in that particular sphere as elsewhere. While the men in some intellectual occupations, in which craft organisation still exists, have been successful in keeping out female competition, the women have been able to gain admission to callings unhampered by craft organisation, as, for instance, journalism, painting, and music.

A consequence of this entire development is, that the number of the educated persons has increased tremendously in comparison with the past; but the favourable consequences which the idealists expected to be derived from a greater diffusion of education, have not been realised. So long as education remains a commodity, the diffusion of education means an increased supply of the commodity, hence a lowering of its prices and consequently a worse position for the owner of the commodity. The number of the educated has grown to an extent that more than satisfies the requirements of the capitalists and of the capitalist state. The labour market of the educated workers is to-day as overcrowded as that of the manual workers. And also the intellectual workers have already their Reserve Army—unemployment is as much known in their ranks as in those of the industrial workers. Those who wish to obtain an appointment under Government have to wait years, often more than a decade, until they are able to get one of the badly paid minor posts. With the others over-work is followed as much by unemployment and vice-versa as with the hand-workers, and the forcing down of wages is practised upon them as upon the latter.

The class position of the educated workers grows perceptibly worse; if before one spoke of the aristocracy of intellect, one now speaks of the proletariat of intelligence; and very soon these latter proletarians will distinguish themselves from the other wage-workers by only one thing—their conceit. The majority of them will still think they are something better than the wage-workers; they still consider themselves to belong to the bourgeoisie, but in a similar way as servants regard themselves as belonging to the family of their masters. They have ceased to be the intellectual leaders of the bourgeoisie and have become their hired prize fighters. The ambition to succeed develops among them; not the cultivation, but the turning to account, of their intellectual gifts now becomes their first consideration, and the prostitution of their being is the principal means of advancement. Like the petty traders, they, too, are deceived by a few big prizes in the lottery of their life; they overlook the numerous blanks which are facing them and bargain away body and soul for the mere prospect of drawing such a big prize. The selling of their own convictions and a marriage for money have become in the estimation of the majority of our "educated," two self-understood as well as indispensable means for "making a fortune." And that is what the capitalist production has made of its explorers, thinkers and dreamers.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, subscriptions for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, articles, correspondence and advertisements submitted for insertion therein should be addressed, — The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 22, Great James Street, London, W.C., to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD is published on the first day in each month.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office every Tuesday at 7 p.m.

Terms of Subscriptions.

UNITED KINGDOM.		
Twelve Months	...	1s. 6d.
Six Months	...	9d.
AMERICA.		
Twelve Months	...	50 cents.
Six Months	...	25 cents.

The Socialist Standard.

SUNDAY,



DEC. 1, 1907.

Socialism and the Unemployed.

The recent Manifesto of the S.D.P. (or is it S.D.F.?) should more properly be dealt with in our "Literary Curiosities" column; for a more remarkable document probably never emanated from any political organisation. As a pronouncement of a "Socialist" Party on so important a question as that of the unemployed it is even more remarkable.

The banquet and the pageant in honour of the Kaiser's visit is "a studied insult to the unemployed of this country," although why so more than the Lord Mayor's Show or any other feast we are not informed. Yet only three lines lower down this "studied insult" is referred to as a "cool manifestation of indifference to the wants of the workers," while yet another change takes place a little further on where the "cool indifference" becomes "a piece of wanton insolence."

But the final stroke is here: "when we read that this arrogant autocrat is to be presented with a Gold Casket we wonder how much more our patience will be called upon to endure." So the presentation to the Kaiser is the last straw. The unemployed can stand many things just as the employed working class stands many things, but the presentation to the Kaiser is really too much.

The whole pronouncement has but two positive propositions to make; one is to the unemployed to "once more" assemble on Tower Hill, and the second is "to let the world know that you are asking 'How long, O Lord, how long?'"

According to *Justice* of November 16th, J. E. Williams, whose signature is appended to the Manifesto as the organiser of the unemployed, although his authorship is doubtful, has been "demanding work for the starving unemployed" for the last twenty years, so that, if we may presume to answer for the Lord, we may safely say that, since twenty years has seen a worsening of the problem despite their efforts, we shall be a very long time yet at the same rate of progress.

The sequel duly followed the demonstration. After the usual speeches and the resolution "calling upon the Government to introduce . . . such legislation as will provide work for all who need it (which the Socialist knows perfectly well a capitalist government would not do if it could, and could not if it would), the usual procession was formed which marched to the accompaniment of the "Red Flag" punctuated with hoots and boos for the Kaiser, until it fell foul of the police, was broken up, and some of its participants arrested.

This farce, for to the Socialist it is undoubtedly as ridiculous a farce as was ever perpetrated in the name of Socialism, is to *Justice* so successful as to be a cause for congratulation to its organiser; although the postscript to the article in *Justice* seems to indicate that the congratulation was penned before the demonstration had taken place!

To us the antics of a professing Socialist body on so essential a manifestation of the insanity of the system they are supposed to be able to point the way out of, is ridiculous in the extreme.

Unemployment is an inevitable feature of capitalism, and is impossible of removal without at the same time abolishing the capitalist system that produces it. That is a fact known to any Socialist with the most elementary knowledge of the economics of capitalism, and is certainly well known to the S.D.F. unemployed organisers. Yet instead of educating the workers, employed as well as unemployed, as to the facts of the case, emphasising that only by the conscious action of the workers upon the political field will their emancipation be accomplished, and concentrating, as Socialists presumably should, on Socialism, and not like the I.L.P. on Old Age Pensions this year and something else next, they consciously mislead the unemployed to imagine that the capitalist government will introduce legislation if only the unemployed call upon them loudly enough. If they don't think that, there is no justification for their resolution.

Yet the fact remains that the prime cause of unemployment is the robbery of the workers by which the capitalist class appropriate the whole of the wealth produced by the workers, returning to them just as much, on the average, as will keep them physically fit to continue working. The difference between the quantities produced and consumed by the working class (a difference continually increasing with every increase in the productivity of labour) represents a surplus which all the waste and all the luxury of its owners cannot absorb, with the result that the markets are glutted with an excess of commodities. Thus the "over-production," the crisis, and the slackening of production involving an increase of unemployment. Since capitalism can never pay such wages to the workers as to enable them to buy back the whole of the wealth they have produced, the existence of an unemployed section is inevitably bound up with the continuation of the system itself. And, paradoxical as it may appear, the only direction in which palliation of that unemployment lies, is along the line of the waste of that surplus, or the channel of charities, &c. that tends to decrease the disproportion between the wealth produced and the wealth enjoyed by the workers that lies at the bottom of the problem of the unemployed.

All this is known to the Socialist, and he, therefore, wastes no time in attempting to palliate that which, in the nature of the case, does not allow of palliation, but by continually pointing out the only direction in which working-class progress can be made, that is by the propaganda of Socialism and the building up of a movement for Socialism as the only solution of the extreme poverty of unemployment, as well as the poverty of employment, works not alone in the sound direction straight towards emancipation, but at the same time inspires the capitalist class with such fear of the wrath to come as to open their purse strings and hasten the administration of their sops for what good they may be worth. The very fact that after the S.D.F. concentration last year and the year before on the question of unemployment an Unemployed Bill, in which they claimed to have seen their influence, was produced and has proved a failure from all points of view, especially the unemployed one, should be sufficient to provoke any Socialists who may still belong to that organisation to consider the advisability of trying the more logical method, the action more in keeping with their professions, that as Socialism is the only solution of unemployment, they will cease to advocate anything else than Socialism.

D.K.

God and the Labour Party.

"One above sees all" is only a variation of the saying, "onlookers see most of the game." Whether or no the truth of either can be demonstrated, it is certain that those not immediately concerned can get plenty of amusement out of the antics of all sections of politicians who are now claiming God as their "guide, philosopher, and friend." Mr. G. H. Roberts, Labour M.P. for Norwich, visited the Burton Town Hall on October 21st and "in language rich in proverbial philosophy advanced the aims and objects of the Labour Party." He had long claimed, he said, that, given an equal opportunity, there was no reason why the workman should not take his place by the side of the wealthy representative

in the House of Commons! He did not explain how the workmen could possibly have an equal opportunity with the wealthy. It would have been difficult, of course. Neither did he suggest that the workers should supplant all the wealthy representatives with a view to depriving them of their power to exploit? No! his "rich proverbial philosophy" finds expression in a desire for a "fair representation of all classes" in the House of Commons. He contended that the Labour movement was not only a sound political movement but it was "the greatest religious factor they had at the present time." The Labour Party believed in the love of God and the brotherhood of man. They wanted the word of God to live in their industrial and human activities. And much more to the same effect. The only inference to be drawn from all this is that during all these years of working-class exploitation, Almighty God has been asleep or has been "winking the other eye" while those who believe in him and his "Love" and his "Word" have been fighting and maiming, and killing and enslaving each other. In the year 50 A.D., it is said, James, the Brother of Jesus, called upon the rich men to weep and howl for the miseries that were to come upon them! "Ye have heaped treasure together for the last days . . . Behold, the hire of the labourers, who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth." . . . "And the cries of them which have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord." Despite this denunciation, the exploiters have continued to carry on business at the old stand, improving their methods, securing more power, and appropriating more wealth. So that it would seem that the Lord has been on their side. And now that the workers are slowly beginning to see the justice of Socialism, the masters who have "made their lives bitter with hard bondage, in mortar, and in brick, and in all manner of service in the field," finding they cannot argue, that they cannot oppose Socialism by other means, are endeavouring to play upon the ignorant passions, prejudices and fears of the people. They know how true were the words that Louis XIV. wrote to the King of Tonquin on January 10th, 1681: "For this God is . . . above all, the most useful in giving to Kings unlimited power over peoples." And the "Socialist" members of the House of Commons should know it also. But instead of boldly and honestly facing the position, instead of avowing on the platform the opinions they hold in private, instead of standing by the scientific position that neither capitalism nor Socialism, as such, has anything to do with speculative opinions as to the existence or non-existence of a god or of gods, good or devilish; they are, for vote-catching purposes, mouthing such twaddle as that which fell from their lips during the Kirkdale election and is quoted above. Let the people, instead of wasting time claiming God for their side, in answer to the exploiters who claim him for theirs, "leave tears and praying," gird up their loins, harden their hearts, and strengthen their hands preparatory to engaging in the final struggle for the overthrow of class supremacy, a struggle that can only succeed when undertaken by a determined and intelligent proletariat.

J.K.

EVERY CLASS WAR IS A POLITICAL WAR.

THE bourgeoisie destroyed the feudal conditions of property; the proletariat will put an end to the bourgeois conditions of property. Between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie a struggle, an implacable war, a war to the knife, is as inevitable as was in its way the struggle between the bourgeoisie and the privileged estates. But every class war is a political war. In order to do away with feudal society the bourgeoisie had to seize upon political power. In order to do away with capitalist society the proletariat must do the same. Its political task is therefore traced out for it beforehand by the force of events themselves, and not by any abstract consideration.

PLECHANOFF—"Anarchism and Socialism."

The Head Office of The Socialist Party of Great Britain is at 22, Great James Street, London, W.C.

SOCIALISM, RELIGION AND EDUCATION.

THE Socialist Party of Great Britain, as a party, stands steadily aloof from "religious" discussions. Why? Because it is a Socialist party.

As Marx says, "The religious world is but the reflex of the real world. For a society based upon the production of commodities, in which the producers in general enter into social relations with one another by reducing their individual private labour to the standard of homogeneous human labour, Christianity, with its cultus of abstract man, more especially in its bourgeois developments, Protestantism, Deism, etc., is the most fitting form of religion." In brief, Christianity, like all religions, is but an expression of material conditions, a direct outcome of social relations, the unsubstantial image of a world reflected in the muddy pool of human intellect. Cannibal savagery, blood-smear Mumbo-Jumbo; patriarchal tyranny, "jealous" Jehovah—Jesus varies with the ages. "Redeemer" of Roman slave; War-God of Crusader; General Overseer of Manufacturing Capitalist; Harp and Crown Dispenser of Hot Gospel in a Charity-Organisation-ridden phase of Society.

TO THE SOCIALIST, MARX HAS SAID THE LAST WORD that need be said on the subject of the relation of Socialism and religion. "The religious reflex of the real world can only finally vanish, when the practical relations of everyday life offer to man none but perfectly intelligible and reasonable relations with regard to his fellow men." Material conditions rule. "The English Established Church will more readily pardon an attack on 38 of its 39 articles than on one-thirtieth of its income." This is as true to-day as when written in 1867.

The position, therefore, of the Revolutionary Socialist, the attitude of The Socialist Party of Great Britain on the question of "Religion" is clear. "Take care of the pennies, the pounds will take care of themselves" says the old tag, which being interpreted for the present occasion means "Seek essentials. You may safely ignore results." The essential to-day for the worker is a grasp of the fact that, while he has nothing to sell but his labour-power, while he is reduced to the rank of a

MERE COMMODITY,

under no conditions whatever can his class be anything but an ignoble conglomeration of wage-slaves, swindled and sweated by capitalist, preyed on by "leaders," one of the sorriest spectacles which the "all-beholding Sun" has witnessed through the ages.

In so far as, and when, Religion allies itself directly with capitalism, the S.P. of G.B., being hostile to every other political organisation, is obviously in opposition to Religion. The greater includes the less. Similarly, when "Rationalism" allies itself with the exploiting class, we are compelled to fight that "ism," especially when such "Rationalism" fantastically tricks itself out in a ludicrous garb which it fondly imagines is Socialism.

F. J. GOULD, "HONORARY ASSOCIATE" OF THE R.P.A., asserts that he is a "Socialist." His fervid faith in positivist moonshine would be of itself sufficient evidence to the contrary, but a perusal of his article, "The Educational Future," in the "R.P.A. Annual" is sufficient to dispel any doubts upon the point. He peddles in trifles. He is much exercised upon such momentous issues as "co-optation" in educational bodies; he "cherishes hopes"—sure mark of the pseudo-Socialist, who is invariably a

"HOPE CHERISHER"

—that the present system under which the worker groans will be made somewhat more bearable; he "demands" (another infallible sign of the so-called Socialist, this "demanding") that "the school shall be deliberately directed to the evolution of willing and happy citizens equipped for devotion to the common welfare,"—in short, while mouthing the word "evolution" he shows his utter lack of the appreciation of the practical lesson which evolution has to teach, namely, that under given conditions, only given results can follow. The spectacle of this "Socialist" "demanding" that the school shall diligently apply itself to the better manufacture of "willing" and "happy" wage-slaves, who, in the

huge majority of cases must enter the ranks of the exploited, must increase the ever-increasing army of unemployed, is one which is calculated to strengthen us in the opinion that the

MOST SERIOUS ENEMY

to the emancipation of the working class to-day is that curious freak of nature, that vertebrate animal without a backbone, the "Socialist" whose knowledge of Socialism extends as far as the knowledge of the name, who would "reform" the chrysalis into a butterfly, place an ambulance at the bottom of the cliff, and generally understudy David, who confessed that he had "erred and played the fool exceedingly."

We are called upon to admire the "half mystical fervour" of Miss Margaret McMillan, who has "urged the necessity of communal baths, medical inspection, etc. for the children of the proletariat." Does it ever occur to this brand of "reformer" that, while they may claim the latter title, they are no more entitled to the term "Socialist" than is the cattle-owner who believes in the virtues of a horse-pond and regularly engages a veterinary surgeon. In short, Miss Margaret McMillan,—who has never concealed her contempt for the "elementary" teacher of the children of the proletariat,—is simply energetically doing work for the capitalist class.

But our chief quarrel with F. J. Gould is his pushing of his pet palliative "Moral Instruction." In schools run for, and in the interests of, the capitalist class, there can be no really "moral instruction." The omission of "Religious Education," and the substitution of the precious syllabus of the "Moral Instruction League" is simply substituting one form of dogmatism for another. It is monstrous to suppose that a fervent belief in miracles on the part of a teacher precludes supervision as to personal cleanliness. It is a disputable matter whether, from the point of view of a Socialist, less harm may not accrue to the child mind from the teaching of mythological Jewish History than from the handling of a lesson on "Patriotism," "Thrift," etc. from the ordinary teacher who has never learned to think beyond the ordinary formulas which a bourgeois society has drilled into him, and who in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, consciously or unconsciously, looks upon his pupils as so much material to be exploited in the unspeakably dirty struggle for "promotion." (Has F. J. Gould

FORGOTTEN HIS TEACHER DAYS?

Does distance lend enchantment to the view?) We heartily endorse the following from his article, and beg him to apply the precepts therein contained to himself: "What we need is the cultivation of the scientific habit, the capacity for seizing significant things, for neglecting unnecessary things, for reducing chaotic things to order."

A. REGINALD.

ASKED AND ANSWERED.

QUESTION.

- (1). Will capitalism have to go through the process of the nationalisation of the land, the mines, the railways, etc., before Socialism can be achieved?
- (2). Would not the fact of the working class being able to see the futility of these reforms—having acquired them—assist in the propaganda of Socialism?
- (3). If so, should not the Socialist Party do all in its power to secure these "palliatives," by adopting a programme on which these items figure, with a view to pushing capitalism forward at as great a rate as possible?
- (4). Would it be possible to establish Socialism, pre-supposing the existence of a clean cut class-conscious proletariat, with capitalism no further advanced than it is to-day, in other words is it more a matter of hastening the development of capitalism than creating the hostile and revolutionary Socialist?

M. MULLETT (Brixton, S.W.)

ANSWER.

- (1). Marx has truly said that "No social order ever disappears until all the productive powers are developed for which it is adapted. New and higher social institutions are never established until the material conditions of life to support them have matured in the womb of the old society. Therefore mankind never sets itself any tasks, except those for which it has received proper training and which it is able to

perform." An industry, however, which is developed to the trust stage is as completely organised as a nationalised industry and differs from it only in that it is controlled by a section instead of by the whole of the capitalist class. Since therefore the trust is a completely organised industry and presents but little if any greater difficulty of acquirement by the workers over a nationalised industry, there is no reason whatever to suppose that Society must of necessity pass through a stage of complete nationalisation.

The productive forces for which modern society is adapted are developed when the essential or chief industries are centralised under trusts or State, for the subordinate industries which have not reached that stage need in the main but the application to them of the form of organisation already developed in the trust or their absorption into the greater industrial organisations by the triumphant working class. So long as the method, structure and material of organised production be existent so that the unmistakable method and solution be presented, the workers, if class-conscious Socialists, can with little difficulty complete the organisation of the productive forces and turn them into social instruments of social welfare.

(2). It should be obvious that if the workers see the futility of reform tinkering, the propaganda of Socialism is enormously assisted. But the recognition of the futility of reform should and can, at least in part, be made plain to the proletarians without them having to exhaust all the possibilities of error, and having to suffer the disappointment and disastrous apathy and delay that such a stupid and wasteful way of showing the futility of reform methods implies.

(3). Clearly, also, the owning class are already causing the development of capitalism to proceed at as great a rate as is possible in their eagerness to secure greater profits, and we as members of the working class need all our available energy, not to increase the profit of our masters, but to help the growth of Socialism among the workers so that class-consciousness may keep pace with the headlong development of capitalism, and industrial democracy be the speedy outcome of the economic evolution.

The advocacy of reform items would not of necessity increase the rate of capitalist development, while it would leave the workers more at the mercy of the exploiters and unprepared to end exploitation even when development were ripe for the change. Indeed, many reforms are designed to head back economic development. Even municipalisation is often a barrier against centralisation and complete organisation.

The stupidity of identifying what is the only hope of the workers with something that must confessedly lead to disappointment, apathy, disgust and reaction and leave the workers unprepared for their deliverance need hardly be enlarged upon.

(4). The existence of such a revolutionary Socialist proletariat is the obvious and inevitable sign of the ripeness of conditions for Socialism. And were prevailing conditions such that so completely Socialist a working class was engendered it could clearly use the productive forces of the day, and, by completing industrial organisation, transform capitalism into Socialism with but little difficulty.

Social change is not a mechanical process but depends on the reaction of the economic evolution upon human beings. Hence the importance of the class struggle. Hence the importance of propaganda in spreading and giving definiteness and conscious aim to the effects of economic pressure to which some respond more readily and intelligently than others. Hence above all the importance of refraining from misleading or humbugging the workers in any way, and the necessity of doing all that one may to put the real issue ever clearly before them even though but a handful have seen the light, for upon the development of Socialist consciousness among our class depends whether they are to remain unhappy wage-slaves indefinitely, or whether they are responding readily and intelligently to the demands of their economic environment and so preparing for their speedy and happy deliverance from poverty and oppression.

W.

THE FRAUD OF MUNICIPAL BAKERIES.

A REPLY TO R. B. SUTHERS.

"BREAD and Bunkum" is the title of an article in which Mr. R. B. Suthers draws, in the *Clarion*, a harrowing, soul-rending picture of the last gasp of the petty shop-keeper, particularly the master baker (perhaps the most pious, unctious, psalm-grinding, callous sweeter civilisation has produced) who is now being crushed by the newest thing in trusts—the Bread Trust.

Mr. Suthers, out of the fulness of his heart, is moved to prescribe a remedy. What is this precious remedy? None other than municipalisation, which he imagines is Socialism. He says: "The only question for the small baker is, 'Am I to be abolished by the Trust or by Socialism?' Allow me to put the problem from a Socialist point of view. Here is a community in which bread is a necessity to life. So much bread is required every day. The question is how to make bread in the cheapest and most expeditious manner. It is plain that in a large town it would be cheaper and more efficient to have one or more large bakeries from which bread could be delivered in motor cars direct to the customers, rather than have a number of small shops with a little hand cart or slow horsed cart each overlapping the district of half-a-dozen others. Local depots might be necessary, but they need not be so numerous nor so large as under the wasteful system of to-day."

If I thought Socialism was anything so monstrous as this glorified capitalism I would fight it for all I was worth.

I have been a victim of this Manchester god of "cheapness" and "expedition" for over twenty years, and during that time have seen many journeyman bakers broken on the wheel of "cheapness," "expedition," and "efficiency." I would ask Mr. Suthers to quit for a while his beloved rate-saving, middle-class view point, and look at the matter from the position as it affects the working class, the only class that matters, or is worth consideration in any way.

Assume that the rate-savers decide to municipalise the bread supply (it won't be decided by master bakers, Mr. Suthers) what happens? To ensure expedition and efficiency, cheapness and other Manchesterisms, it will be necessary to have the newest and most down-to-date machinery operated in the most scientific manner and the latest manner is this: A large bakery is erected on scientific principles, that is, the interior of the structure is divided into two bakeries, exact duplicates, each with its gear of flour sifters, sack shakers, dough mixers, dividers, moulders, provers, ovens and storing racks, with one clock for the use of both. No partition divides them, so that the gangs of nearly naked, emaciated slaves work in full view of each other, each driven by an enslaved slave-driver.

At the stroke of the clock the two gangs begin their mad race against time and efficient, untiring machinery. An industrial policeman, called the General Foreman, who is not necessarily a baker, clad in snow white cap and overalls, stalks majestically from gang to gang, book in hand, recording by the common clock the time each gang takes to finish its "rounds," not that the most "expeditious" may be decorated with a "Crown of Wild Olive," but that the laggards may be called upon to render an account of their stewardship in that capitalist hell of "cheapness, expedition, and efficiency," and the misfits weeded out and "scrapped." This mode of procedure brings out the tigish instincts of the ganger, who is especially selected for his ability to drive and bully, and who is always on his trial, and can only retain his job by keeping time with his "opposite" or by running past him, consequently the "hand" who slows down or does not hear a shouted order is "woken up" with a torrent of foul abuse and indecent oaths. The hawk-eyed "Pinkerton" looks on and makes a note. Such is a modern bakery!

In one of these efficient infernos I wot of, the most happy human machine is a big and powerful deaf mute, who works by watching the others. He never complains, nor does he hear the ganger's live and modern English, nor "the roaring loom of time," as typified by bread-making machinery. Yet he is sometimes pitted as being afflicted!

In a factory of this description the output per man engaged averages about twenty-two sacks of flour per week: in handcraft bakery it averages about twelve sacks. It is obvious, therefore, that as the industry becomes either trustified or municipalised, a large number of bakers will be thrown on the streets, and the market is already overcrowded with this class of merchandise, as a visit to the factory gates at 11 p.m. will testify. After that hour the poor devils who have failed to secure a night's job may be seen tramping, Christ knows where, while their brilliantly lighted municipal trams, only half filled, glide past them. Perhaps by tramping through the slush and rain in broken boots they can meditate the better on the advantages of municipalising the trams, which Mr. Suthers with ghastly irony, told us a time ago now belongs to all the people. Mr. Suthers does not say what municipalisation will do for these, or for the "outed" master bakers, the redundant carmen, the superfluous shop-girls, millers' travellers, shop fitters, and a host of others who will go into the ranks of the unemployed, and in the fulness of time become unemployables, wretches with drooping lips and slouching gait, fit material for the casual ward and the lunatic asylum, if no worse fate awaits them.

Mr. Suthers, in his tender solicitude for the small master (the ever-starving journeyman seem to be an entirely negligible quantity) asks: "Will the trust buy him out?" and answers: "No! the trust will freeze him out." "Will the trust," he goes on, "find the starving shop-keepers work? Will it?" No, Mr. Suthers, it will not, neither will the municipality buy him out, though, certainly, he may secure a job by the influence of his co-religionists on the council. If he be a Freemason he may even become a "Pinkerton."

Mr. Suthers concludes by asking "Why then should we not organise this business of making bread, and put an end for ever to the degrading condition and struggle for existence between rival bakeries?" And my answer is because it would be better to eliminate all the "business" out of industry absolutely, and make bread to be eaten, not to lower rates. Municipalities go into business to make profit only, like any other capitalist concern. It does not signify whether the owners absorb the profits in the shape of "reduced prices" or lower rates. If the working class is enabled to buy cheap bread the operation of the "Iron Law of Wages" will secure all the advantage for the capitalists, as it did in the days of the saintly Bright, when the corn laws were repealed. Capital is always the same in its effect on the working class, whether manipulated by an individual capitalist, joint-stock enterprise, municipality or government, and with each step in concentration the working class gets relatively less and the master class gets richer, more corrupt and more bestial, as recent events in Berlin and elsewhere show.

Why should all the bread be made in factories, anyhow? In a Socialist community the housewife would have the facilities, if she so wished, to make bread and pastries for herself, her mate and her children, and to suit their individual palates. The essence of Socialism is freedom, and if a woman prefers to develop her individuality by making pure and wholesome food she will be at liberty to do so. All healthy humans must expend their energies in some manner, and why not in cooking?—who shall say them nay?

The damnable idea of being marshalled and drilled, or numbered and docketed, like any other merchandise, in a state of glorified capitalism is not the Socialist's ideal, but its antithesis, no matter what the capitalists and their protagonists, the pseudo-Socialists, choose to name it. We don't want to be driven to the gate of the municipal or other factory to hustle and elbow our fellows out of the way so that we may catch the official's eye in the mad and sordid scramble for mere belly food, for a mere animal subsistence, to be thrown on the social scrap-heap the moment we cease to be "expeditious," there to rot out a living death, the mental agony prolonged by being kept on the brink of Kingdom Come by a "George Barnes" pension, previously deducted from our competition wage. With the advent of Socialism the whole of the capitalist State and its superstructure will collapse, with its cant of living wages, its Brotherhoods of Man, and the rest of its nauseous humbug.

Socialism will enable us to co-operate with our fellows for the production and distribution of all the necessities and comforts of life, and to further bring under control the forces of nature for the common weal. Then and then only will the humanities have a chance. Then we shall live, stand erect and be men and women. Away with all forms of capitalism! Speed the Social Revolution!

W. WATTS.

THE INTERNATIONAL.

MARX and Engels had no misapprehension whatsoever as to the fact that the first International could only be the means of carrying and spreading a knowledge of Socialism among the wage-workers throughout the world. Such a task, in face of the great apathy and ignorance of the toilers, was a tremendous one, as the history of the first International has demonstrated. Yet it cannot be gainsaid that the International from 1863 till 1872 was a far greater educational power among the proletariat than the present International, which was inaugurated in 1889. This comparison becomes more significant still when it is asserted by prominent writers and speakers of the present labour movement that the first International was only a roof without the house, while the second, the present International, is a house with a roof. Marx and Engels never claimed any more for the first International than that it was an *awning* under which the toilers of the world were to be gathered in order to acquire a sound knowledge of capitalist society and of their position therein. And during the nine years of its existence it was indeed a powerful factor in the class struggle throughout the civilised world. The present International, however, is a house without a roof for all the good it is to the proletariat. Look back at that old International and you must feel astounded at the terror it drove into the hearts of the possessing class and their satellites; and why? Simply because it breathed revolution through and through; and Marx and Engels did their utmost to maintain the flame of the revolution. With the tremendous advantages the present International possesses and has since it was inaugurated, as compared with the great difficulties of the first International, it is evident that the present International has by no means made the most of its opportunities. When in 1863 the first International saw the light there were practically only Marx, Engels, and a few other stalwarts to take up the gigantic task. Marx and Engels were then in the midst of their analysis of the capitalist system, which later on became the basis of the scientific Socialist movement. At the beginning of the first International there was only the Communist Manifesto, a work excellent in its way, but lacking the detailed exposition that followed in "Das Capital." The Franco-German War, the Paris Commune, the many great fights and skirmishes of the workers with the capitalist class in every country from that period until 1889, when the second International was inaugurated, were certainly historic events from which splendid lessons ought to have been drawn by the international proletariat; but that was not to be.

The first International shines in the history of the international working-class movement as an epoch of revolutionary propaganda among the proletariat that is not in the least degree approached by the newer movement.

The first International Congress in connection with the first International was held at Geneva in 1866, followed by similar Congresses in 1867 at Lausanne, in 1868 at Brussels, 1869 at Basle, and in 1872 at The Hague. No Congresses were held in 1870 and 1871. During these two years the young International was sorely tried and proved too weak to withstand the exceptionally heavy onslaught made upon it. The Franco-German War and the subsequent Paris Commune were the primary causes of the collapse of the International in 1872, while the hostile position taken up by the bulk of the English Trade Unions against the brave and noble Communards, together with the fact that anarchist tactics were introduced and insisted upon by Bakounin and others were certainly most effective contributory factors to the ultimate fall of the first International. It has been frequently asserted by bourgeois writers and

speakers and occasionally repeated by so-called Socialists that Marx was mainly responsible for the Paris Commune. Nothing is more erroneous. Marx knew the extent, power and possibilities of the first International too well to have advocated a sectional trial of strength between the practically unorganised proletariat and the capitalist class.

Marx and Engels, who had throughout the first International aided and advised it in person and by correspondence, continued to be helpers and guides in the different countries even after the first International had collapsed in 1872. When in 1883 Marx died, Engels remained in personal touch with the working-class organisations almost until his death in 1894, paying them visits in the summer and corresponding with them during the winter.

But although the Socialist movement in the different countries had since the fall of the first International nominally accepted the Socialist teachings of Marx and Engels and the principles of the class struggle underlying them, the development of the political action of the respective Socialist parties almost in every country tended more and more towards opportunism, so that when the second International was inaugurated in 1889 the opportunist Parliamentarism of the German, Austrian and French parties and the reform tendency of the English, American, Belgian, Dutch, Italian, Swiss and other national parties, that had not yet entered upon a Parliamentary career, naturally found their reflection in the first and following assemblies of the present International. At each of these re-unions the opportunists and reformers were to the fore and easily overpowered the few valiant revolutionaries to whom the policy and tactics of negotiating with the capitalist class for "dirty patches on the wage-slavery garment" were treachery and abomination. And just in the proportion in which in the different countries the Socialist parties attached ever more importance to catching votes for Parliamentary and Municipal candidates running on reform programmes, the revolutionary propaganda was more and more relegated to the rear, till to-day we have a so-called International Socialist movement embracing organisations and individuals that are beyond a doubt purely bourgeois-radical in composition and action. And so long as such conditions prevail the working-class movement will make no headway.

The constitution of the International Congresses is, as we know so well, a purely theoretic one. Any working-class organisations avowing recognition of the class-struggle at the time of claiming admission have no difficulty whatever in being accepted. They may immediately before and after each Congress repudiate or grossly violate the principles of the class struggle; they may, in fact, be Liberal or Radical organisations at home; but so long as they pretend to be in accord with the class-war attitude, they are heartily welcome at these triennial gatherings.

And what is the composition of these Congresses in consequence? Let us briefly analyse it for our readers' benefit. The English delegation undoubtedly carries off the palm.

First and foremost comes the Labour Party with a constitution supposing independence on pronouncedly non-Socialist lines. In Parliament they are represented by 30 members, who were elected mainly by open or secret compromise with the Liberal Party and on Radical programmes. In Parliament and out of it they have over and over again assured the Liberal Party that they would be perfectly friendly with them so long as that friendliness would be reciprocated.

Next comes the bourgeois Fabian Society with its four members, who were at the last General Election returned as official Liberal representatives, and with a host of official progressive Municipal Councillors. The Fabians want a state of Society, where "Fabian intellect" shall dominate the masses on the "economic" basis of the "rent of ability."

A further composite of the English section is the I.L.P., who deny and violate the principles of the class war all the time they are at home. Their members of Parliament were returned by the help of the Labour and Liberal parties. They spend all their efforts in propagating hopeless palliatives and reforms and in the real class

struggle continually compromise with the capitalist class.

The S.D.F. support capitalist cat's-paws of the anti-Socialist labour type, and pursue a propaganda of palliatives and reforms, which finds its highest expression in waiting upon capitalist Cabinet Ministers and bourgeois Members of Parliament, to beg of them to push forward "Healthy Legislation for the Suffering Proletariat, etc."

Besides this array of "sound revolutionary" political organisations there are a few "craft-unions," that keep up their membership by their "starvation pension schemes and coffin clubs" mingled with the hope of being able to do something "very soon" for the unemployed with the most valuable aid of the Right Honorable John Burns, whom they support during his election, and then denounce as traitor if the hoped-for reforms are not forthcoming.

But this confusion and opportunism is not, as pointed out previously, only rampant among the organisations that form the British Section of this unhappy International. Take Germany for instance. Here you have the much-boasted of three and a quarter million votes at the last general election, yet the membership of the Socialist Party comprises about 600,000 only, scarcely 18 per cent. of the number of voters. It is true that the number of trade unionists has risen to nearly two millions; but a third of these are members of Liberal or religious trade unions, that are entirely under the sway of the capitalist class; and other trade unions are so-called "neutral" ones, that is to say, they are craft unions, independent of the Socialist Party. In the political arena the German Party is dominated by the Reformers and the Revisionists, and in their Parliamentary and Municipal actions they are steeped to the eyebrows in bourgeois reforms and palliatives, while the revolutionary propaganda is left to a very few much despised "Rickers."

In France there was until the International Congress in 1904 at Amsterdam, a body of real revolutionaries—the Guesdists. But in consequence of the "unity" craze these revolutionary fighters fused with the Reformers, the followers of Jaurès, about two years ago on the following terms: "The United Party is a party of the class struggle, which, even if for the benefit of the workers it takes advantage of minor conflicts among the possessing class or joins in action with a political party for the purpose of defending the rights and interests of the proletariat, remains nevertheless an opposition party, which in principle irreconcilably faces the bourgeois class and their tool—the State." The Reformers have, at least temporarily, bamboozled the Guesdists; but judging from the proceedings at the last Congress of the Party, some few weeks ago, there are already many bad sores, which can only lead to a split in the near future. The trade union question, the anti-militarist agitation and the Revisionist tendencies of the followers of Jaurès must bring matters to a head very soon. The United Party during the last general election obtained nearly 900,000 votes, 52 of their candidates having been elected. Yet the members of the United Party number only about 52,000. There are about one and a half million trade unionists in France. Half of these are either Nationalists or Radicals, or do not believe in political action at all. The remaining half are composed of men, most of whom consider it detrimental to the cause of Labour for the trade unions to work in co-operation with the Socialist Party. This question is the great bone of contention between the Guesdists and the followers of Jaurès, who insist upon the trade unions remaining "neutral," whatever that may mean. It is most probable that mainly through that difference the Guesdists will leave the United Party very shortly.

A similar state of things is reflected in the delegations of almost every country, and the truth forces itself upon us that the International Socialist Congress is, as far as the majority is concerned, Socialist in name only, many indeed repudiating even the name.

For the triumph of Socialism, national and international, organisation is essential, but the organisation must be for Socialism and based on Socialist principles or such organisation can be nothing to the workers but a delusion and a snare.

H.N.

THE ODD MEN!

Mr. Lloyd George, the "statesman of the day," the man of "dogged determination," "marvellous tact," etc., etc., as all the Tory and Liberal papers and politicians have hailed him since he induced Mr. R. Bell and his friends to sign that historical document which is dealt with elsewhere in this issue, has been making remarks about the Labour members. Speaking at Mad-eley, Salop, on November 1st, he said:

There were only five or six Socialists in the House of Commons. Five out of 600! Well, what were five among so many? The Labour people were not Socialists. In the House of Commons they assisted the Liberal Party to carry practical measures, and even the Socialists, though some of them might make very wild speeches outside, in the House of Commons were thoroughly tame. (Laughter.) He had never heard them propose a resolution in favour of upsetting Society; he had never heard a revolutionary statement emerging from them. There they were, amending the Trade Disputes Bill, or tinkering up some other Bills, and doing some odd jobs of that kind in the Liberal workshop—(laughter and cheers)—in fact earning their living in an honest way in the great party factory.

Similar statements have been made from time to time in the columns of this paper, but Mr. Lloyd George has an advantage over the members of the working class who, during the brief respite from toil permitted to them by capitalism, write, without fee or hope of reward, the articles for *THE SOCIALIST STANDARD*. He can speak from an inside knowledge of the sayings and doings of the Labour members, whilst the writers in this paper must mainly rely upon what is reported concerning them. The similarity of views is interesting. Can it be that Mr. Lloyd George, like other prominent members of the Government, is a regular reader of our journal?

Undoubtedly, some folks expected great things when twenty-nine Labour candidates were returned to the House of Commons, especially as that number included several who, being members of the S.D.F. and the I.L.P., were supposed to be Socialists. But we of the Socialist Party of Great Britain had no false ideas on the matter. Long before the election, in our Manifesto, we had dealt with that fraud, the L.R.C./When the election was over we showed conclusively that the result was neither a victory for Socialism nor for Labour but for Confusion. We explained why we expected nothing from the victors and we have not been disappointed but justified. They could only do odd jobs in the Liberal workshop because they were only elected to do them. Had they been elected as Socialists by Socialists, Mr. Lloyd George would be telling a different tale to-day, but knowing all the circumstances he can no longer restrict himself to laughing up his sleeve, but must laugh aloud at the suggestion that these "respectable, adaptable, and sensible" Labour members are dangerous to the exploiting class.

A YOUNG MAN IN A HURRY.

Mr. J. R. CLYNES, M.P., is certainly a "young man in a hurry." During the Kirkdale Election he declared that the Labour Party would have been well worth creating if in the next ten years they did nothing more than settle the question of old age pensions. So there you are, you "too old at forty" wage slaves, you "scrapped" merchandise, ("scrapped" because the Workmen's Compensation Act, for the passing of which Mr. Clynès and his Labour Party friends claim such credit, has decided your employers only to run risks with young and active men), give them time (ten years) and this precious, enthusiastic, impatient, impulsive Labour Party will settle the question of old age pensions. And how will they "settle" it? Mr. Will Thorne, M.P., as a member of the S.D.F. is pledged to "free and adequate State pensions or provision for aged and disabled workers," but what constitutes an "aged" worker is not stated. As members of the I.L.P., Mr. Thorne's fellow-officials of the Gasworkers' Union, Messrs. Clynès and

Pete Curran, are pledged to "State pensions for every person over 50 years of age, and adequate provision for all widows, orphans, sick, and disabled persons." But as members of the "Labour Party" all three are restricted to "five shillings" a whole five shillings, accompanied by a tract warning the recipients not to waste it in riotous living) per week to all workers over 65 years of age. And as Messrs. Clynes & Co. speak, not as members of the I.L.P. or S.D.F., but of the Labour Party, it is on the five shillings a week basis that they will settle the old age problem and they want ten years to do it! These be stirring times!

THE TRUE ANTIDOTE.

THE true antidote to revolutionary Socialism, said Lord Milner to the Surrey Unionists on October 30th, is practical social reform, and he counselled his hearers to be more and not less strenuous in removing the causes of the revolutionary propaganda, while resisting it to the utmost. Commenting upon his speech, the *Daily Chronicle* asserted that revolutionary Socialism must be opposed by Liberal and Conservative alike. Quite so, but "social reform," such as old age pensions, better housing, town planning, sanitary conditions of labour, the extinction of sweating, the physical training of the people, continuation schools, and other items constituting "an excellent program," should be pushed forward by all parties opposed to Socialism, in order to remove the causes of the revolutionary propaganda! Most of the items quoted above are found in the programs of the S.D.F. and I.L.P., and thus the capitalists will assist these bodies to carry them into practice knowing that they are "the true antidote to revolutionary Socialism." Surely such an avowal should open the eyes of the organisations referred to and lead them to discard a policy which is helping the master class and which is supported by the master class because they know it will head back revolutionary Socialism. The owners of the means of wealth production do not fear Social Reform because it will leave them in possession of the power to exploit, but they do fear Socialism because that will deprive them of the power to exploit. To the Socialist then, the course is clear: advocate Socialism and leave its opponents to push reform.

BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, &c. to be obtained of the S.P.G.B., 22, Great James St., London, E.C.

CAPITAL (Karl Marx) ... 5s. 6d.

SOCIALIST STANDARD

Vols. I, II, & III, (Bound) each 3s. 6d.

3 Vols., bound in one ... 5s. 6d.

MANIFESTO OF THE S.P.G.B. ... 1d.

RULES OF THE S.P.G.B. ... 2d.

S.P.G.B. EMBLEM ... 3d.

FROM HANDICRAFT TO

CAPITALISM (Kautsky) 1d.

ART, LABOUR & SOCIALISM (Morris) 1d.

ALL POST FREE.

SUNDAY EVENINGS

AT

Battersea Branch

(LABURNHAM HOUSE, 134, HIGH STREET).

Dec. 1st—SOCIAL FOR MEMBERS AND FRIENDS.

8th—J. KENT:

"The Program of the S.D.F."

15th—R. H. KENT:

"The Labour Movement Past and Present."

22nd—T. A. JACKSON:

"Direct Action."

Commence at 7.30 p.m. Questions, Discussion.

Opponents warmly welcomed.

TO NEWSAGENTS.

"The Socialist Standard" and all other publications of The Socialist Party of Great Britain are supplied to the trade by Henderson's, 15a, Paternoster Row, London, E.C., and 66, Charing Cross Rd., London, W.C.

Printed by A. Jacomb, Globe Press, Forest Lane, Stratford, for the Proprietors, The Socialist Party of Great Britain, and published at 22, Great James Street, London.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

HEAD OFFICE:

22, GREAT JAMES STREET, LONDON, W.C.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—A. Jones, Secretary, 3, Mathew St., Latchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at S.P.G.B., Laburnam House, 134, High Street, Battersea, S.W. Club open every evening.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Executive Committee. Applications should be sent to the General Secretary.

EAST HAM.—W. Gifford, Sec., 31, Maryland Square, Stratford. Branch meets Mondays at 7.30 at 447, Katherine Rd., Forest Gate.

EDMONTON.—Sidney Auty, Sec. 60, Gilpin Grove, Edmonton. Branch meets Wednesdays 8.30.

FULHAM.—E. Waller, Secretary, 45, Warple Way, Wandsworth, S.W. Branch meets alternate Mondays at 8.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Fri. at 8.30 at 79, Grove Rd., Holloway. Communications to the Sec.

MANCHESTER.—J. Marsh, Sec., 97, Blantyre Street, Swinton, Nr. Manchester.

PADDINGTON.—W. T. Hopley, Sec., 92, Rucklidge Avenue, Harlesden, N.W. Branch meets every Wednesday, 8.30 p.m., at Harley's Coffee Tavern (foot of Lock Bridge), Harrow Rd.

PECKHAM.—W. Wren, Sec., 91, Evelina Rd., Nunhead, S.E. Branch meets every Wed. at 8.30

ROMFORD DIVISION.—All communications to the Secretary, S.P.G.B. Club, 39, York Road, Ilford. Branch meets Mondays at 8 at Club.

TOOTING.—Communications to the Secretary, 86, Mellison Road, Tooting, where branch meets every Wednesday, at 8.30 p.m.

TOTTENHAM.—T. W. Lobb, Sec. Branch meets Mondays at 8 p.m., at Sunbeam Coffee Tavern, 258, High Rd., followed by discussion class.

WATFORD.—T. Wilkins, Sec., 4, Marlborough Rd., Branch meets alternate-Fridays at 8 p.m.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Mondays 7.30, followed at 8.30 by discussion, at 447, Katherine Road, Forest Gate.

WOOD GREEN.—H. Crump, Secretary, 39, Hermitage Road, Harringay, N. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Mondays at 8.30 at 2, Station Road, Wood Green.

MANIFESTO

OF THE

Socialist Party of Great Britain.

Second Edition, with preface, now ready.

Explains the Party's position towards the

S.D.F., I.L.P., Fabian Society, Trade

Unions, S.L.P., etc.

Price - One Penny.

Post free 1d. per copy from the S.P.G.B., 22, Great James Street, London, W.C.

ART, LABOUR

and

SOCIALISM.

By WILLIAM MORRIS.

Price - One Penny.

Post free 1d. from the S.P.G.B., 22, Great James Street, London, W.C.

From Handicraft to Capitalism,

Translated from the German of

KARL KAUTSKY.

The only translation in the English language of this important section of the famous "Das Erfurter Program."

POST FREE ... 1d.

From S.P.G.B., 22, Great James St., London, W.C.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

HOLDS

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master-class, and the consequent enslavement of the working-class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class-struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working-class from the domination of the master-class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working-class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist-class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working-class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working-class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master-class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

APPLICATION FOR MEMBERSHIP.

To the Secretary,

.....Branch, S.P.G.B.

I hereby declare my adhesion to the above principles, and request enrolment as a member of The Socialist Party of Great Britain.

Signature.....

Address.....

.....

.....

Date.....

SPECIAL NOTE.—This form cannot be accepted if detached from Declaration printed above. The complete column must be handed to branch Sec.